University of Alberta

READING AND RE-READING JOSIAH: A CRITICAL STUDY OF JOSIAH IN CHRONICLES

by

Kenneth A. Ristau ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Religious Studies Program

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring 2005

0-494-08001-9

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN:
Our file *Notre reference*
ISBN:

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

For my daughter, Delaney: Daddy loves you and ...

ABSTRACT

Using a multi-dimensional literary and historical-critical approach, this thesis provides an analysis of the Josiah narrative in Chronicles (2 Chr 34–35) and calls attention to rhetorical strategies in the text that create or reinforce aspects of a Jewish identity in the Achaemenid Persian period. This approach privileges the text as an artefact of an ancient discourse that communicates messages about the community that wrote, received, read, and re-read it. In this thesis, I demonstrate that the transformation of biblical tradition, as reflected in the Chr's portrait of King Josiah, conditions the audience(s) of the text towards new politico-cultural and religious realities consistent with that community's loss of independence, its experience of exile and restoration, and the emergence of Persian governance. The portrait of Josiah in Chronicles attempts to resolve the problems of continuity and discontinuity with earlier texts and so reclaim its history for its present.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was completed with the important financial support of a Canada Graduate Scholarship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, a Walter H. Johns Fellowship from the University of Alberta, and a teaching assistantship under the supervision of Dr. Francis Landy. I am also grateful for the important resources that the University of Alberta makes available to its graduate students, especially the Inter-Library Loan program and the ATLA Online Databases with Serials.

It is also my pleasure to acknowledge the contributions of several scholars to my research. Gary Knoppers, who has given me so much support and guidance since I met him nearly four years ago, provided a pre-publication draft of his Anchor Bible Commentary on Chronicles as well as several articles. Similarly, Christine Mitchell provided two as yet unpublished conference presentations while Marc Zvi Brettler forwarded me an article he had only recently published. Louis Jonker sent me a copy of his monograph on Josiah and provided valuable critiques on chapter two of this thesis. I am also especially thankful for the wonderful owners of OakTree Software, Roy and Helen Brown, who generously provided review copies of Accordance Bible Software that were invaluable in my research.

In my academic career to this point, I have been fortunate to study under great professors whose instruction and direction has been invaluable. In particular, I need to acknowledge the guidance and mentorship of Tyler F. Williams, Francis Landy, and Ehud Ben Zvi. These men have supported my academic career in innumerable ways but, more than this, they are also men whom I am honored and grateful to call friends. Their impact on my life, personal and professional, is immeasurable.

Closest to my heart is my family: my oma, my parents, my sisters and their families, and, most of all, my daughter. Through difficult times, in different ways, they have been unwavering in their love and support. Thank-you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

Chapter 1 Beginnings 1

1.1 The Problem 1
1.2 Assumptions 4
1.3 Methodology 7

Chapter 2 The Literary Technique: Structure and Form of the Narrative 10

2.1 Patterns of Repetition 10
2.1.1 Inclusio 11
2.3.2 Key Words and Phrases 17
2.3.2.1 Cohesion 17
2.3.2.2 Transition 22
2.3.3 Concentricity 23
2.2 Chronological or Temporal Markers 25
2.5 Scenes and Sequences 30
2.6 Synthesis 33

Chapter 3 Of Reforms and Festivals: The Reign of Josiah 36

3.1 The Restorer of Order 36
3.2 The Purge 39
3.3 The Repairs 41
3.4 The Book of the Law and Huldah's Prophecy 44
3.5 The Covenant 47
3.6 The Passover 53

Chapter 4 Of Prophets and Monarchs: The Death of Josiah 64

4.1 The Fall 64
4.2 The Death 68
4.3 The Eulogy 79

Chapter 5 The Power of the Text 83

5.1 The Audience 83
5.2 The Message(s) 85
5.3 Conclusion 92

Bibliography 94

Appendix A Reference Data 105

A.1 Succession Formulas in Chronicles 105

A.2 Table of the Distribution of Grammatical Forms in Use in Major Units.....106
A.3 Table of Structural Techniques in Use in Major Units 107
A.4 Structure of 2 Chr 33:25b–36:1 with Notes on Chronology and Direct Speech (DS) 108

Chapter 1

Beginnings

1.1 The Problem

In historical, source, and redaction critical studies of the HB, Josiah king of Judah often occupies a pivotal place. Any student or scholar of biblical studies will typically know something of the enormous body of literature that exists on Josiah, especially as the key figure in theories of the historical development of the Israelite religion as well as the sources and development of the biblical text.[1] These studies, in large part, have roots in work on the Dtr and, in particular, the account of Josiah's reign in 2 Kings 22–23. This account, particularly the report of the finding of the book of the law (2 Kgs 22:8-9) and the extensive reforms (2 Kgs 23:1-25) this find inaugurates, has captured the imagination of many scholars, who have since then expanded their studies to look for Josiah in the prophetic writings and other books of the HB.

Despite all the work on Josiah, however, the story of Josiah in Chronicles has received comparatively little attention. For example, in Sweeney's recent work *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel*, there is a systematic analysis of the ideological perspectives on Josiah in the HB and yet the Chr's two chapters on the king are almost completely ignored.[2] In fact, Sweeney's work makes reference to 2 Chr 34–35 only in the context of the discussion on the Dtr

---

[1] See, e.g., the bibliographies in Antti Laato, *Josiah and David Redivivus: The Historical Josiah and the Messianic Expectations of Exilic and Postexilic Times* (ConBOT 33; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992), 378-403; Marvin A. Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 325-341. For many scholars, the reign of Josiah marks the apex of Israelite/Judean socio-political power and a watershed in the history of Yahwism and the biblical text, particularly Dtr/Dtr theology and writings, centralization and monotheism in the cult, and even the beginnings of messianism. It is difficult to overstate the significant place of Josiah in biblical scholarship.

[2] Sweeney, *King Josiah*, passim.

and then only briefly.[3] This tendency is typical of the work on Josiah by biblical scholars.[4] It seems likely that this results from a perception that the narrative in Chronicles is late and a tendentious revision of the narrative in Kings that downplays Josiah.[5] Seen as derivative, the Josiah narrative in Chronicles is dismissed as unimportant and uninsightful. Although perhaps understandable, this is a mistake.

The work that does exist on the Chr's Josiah is limited to essentially three areas: the Chr's chronology of events, the Chr's presentation of the Josiah Passover, and the Chr's report of Josiah's death. In historical-critical studies, most attention has concentrated on evaluating the historicity of the Chr's alternative chronology of events in Josiah's reign and the Chr's portrayal of Josiah's death.[6] In addition to that work, Barrick has written a comparative analysis of Josiah's reforms that uncharacteristically (for such studies) gives significant attention to the Chr's account.[7] In tradition-history studies and studies of Israelite religion, Josiah's Passover has often figured prominently in the discussions.[8] In source-critical analysis, Williamson and Begg have

---

[3] Sweeney, *King Josiah*, 3-5.

[4] See Laato, *Josiah and David Redivivus*, 329-330, e.g., who hardly does much better than Sweeney, assigning a mere page to the "depiction of Josiah in Chr."

[5] See Laato, *Josiah and David Redivivus*, 329-330, e.g., who argues, "The Chronicler probably wanted to avoid an ideology (and eventual vicarious interpretation of Josiah's death) which used Josiah as a model because this would have conflicted with his views of retribution and messianic expectation; the righteous king must succeed."

[6] In addition to the standard biblical histories of Israel, see esp. Bern Alfrink, "Die Schlacht bei Megiddo und der Tod des Josias," *Bib* 15 (1934): 173-184; J. Boehmer, "König Josias Tod," *ARW* 30 (1933): 199-203; W. W. Cannon, "A Note on Dr. Welch's Article 'The Death of Josiah'," *ZAW* 44 (1926): 63-64; Mordechai Cogan, "The Chronicler's Use of Chronology as Illuminated by Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions" in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 197-210; B. Couroyer, "Le litige entre Josias et Néchao (II Chron. 35:20 ff.)," *RB* 55 (1948): 388-396; Frank M. Cross and David N. Freedman, "Josiah's Revolt against Assyria," *JNES* 12, no. 1 (1953): 56-58; Jacob M. Myers, *II Chronicles: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 13; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), 201-216; Hayim Tadmor, "Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah," *JNES* 15, no. 4 (1956): 226-230; Adam C. Welch, "Death of Josiah," *ZAW* 43 (1925): 255-260.

[7] W. Boyd Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries: Toward a New Understanding of Josiah's Reform* (ed. The Board of the Quarterly; VTSup 88; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

[8] See, e.g., Ehud Ben Zvi, "Revisiting 'Boiling in Fire' in 2 Chr 35:13" (paper presented at the Sixteenth Annual Midwest Jewish Studies Colloquium, Case Western Reserve University, The Samuel Rosenthal Jewish Studies Center, Cleveland, May 2004); Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985; repr., 1989), 137-143; Leonhard Rost, "Josias Passa" in *Theologie in Geschichte und Kunst* (Witten: Luther Verlag, 1968; Judah B. Segal, *The Hebrew Passover From the Earliest Times to A.D. 70* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963); Judson R.

engaged in a spirited exchange in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* on the integrity of the Chr's report of Josiah's death while Talshir has contributed to the discussion with a study of the three strata of the account of Josiah's death in Kings, Chronicles, and Esdras.[9]

In the past year, some attention has finally been given to some of the literary and communicative issues raised by the Chr's text. Jonker has produced a monograph on the Chr's Josiah using Hardmeier's pragmatic-rhetorical approach in which he analyzes the chronological and temporal markers as a guide to understanding the communicative intent of the narrative;[10] Mitchell has presented a paper on the death of Josiah in which she considers some of the literary and ideological problems of the text;[11] and, Ben Zvi has presented a paper on the Chr's exegetical technique in 2 Chr 35:14 to provide insight on the Chr's accomodations to Torah legislation.[12]

This corpus of work should not go unnoticed; the work on the Passover and the recent works of Talshir, Jonker, Mitchell, and Ben Zvi are critically important for any prospective discussions of the text. However, it is an inadequate corpus in that none of this work, except Jonker's monograph, takes a systematic look at the Josiah narrative and its place within Chronicles. This problem is all the more glaring in that such studies exist on nearly all the other kings in Chronicles. This is the problem that this thesis aims to resolve.

Shaver, *Torah and the Chronicler's History Work: An Inquiry into the Chronicler's References to Laws, Festivals and Cultic Institutions in Relation to Pentateuchal Legislation* (BJS 196; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 104-117, esp. 114-116.

[9] Christopher T. Begg, "The Death of Josiah in Chronicles: Another View," *VT* 37, no. 1 (1987): 1-8; Zipora Talshir, "The Three Deaths of Josiah and the Strata of Biblical Historiography (2 Kings xxiii 29-30, 2 Chronicles xxxv 20-25, 1 Esdras i 23-31)," *VT* 46, no. 2 (1996): 213-236; H. G. M. Williamson, "The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History," *VT* 32, no. 2 (1982): 242-248; "Reliving the Death of Josiah: A Reply to C. T. Begg," *VT* 37, no. 1 (1987): 9-15. On Josephus's use of the Josiah story, see Christopher T. Begg, "The Death of Josiah: Josephus and the Bible," 64, no. 1 (1988): 157-163.

[10] Louis Jonker, *Reflections of King Josiah in Chronicles: Late Stages of the Josiah Reception in 2 Chr 34f.* (ed. Christof Hardmeier; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2003).

[11] Christine Mitchell, "The Ironic Death of Josiah in 2 Chronicles" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, November 2003).

[12] Ben Zvi, "'Boiling in Fire'", 1-14.

Though dismissed in the past, a study of the Josiah narrative in Chronicles can provide useful insight on the development of the tradition regarding this king and therefore inform studies of Josiah in other parts of the HB as well as create a new avenue of investigation for historical-critical studies. The Chr's presentation of Josiah, while perhaps derivative from a source-critical and redaction-critical perspective, is nevertheless a creative literary and ideological perspective unique to the Chr. Because this perspective is preserved in an ancient text that belonged to a particular community, the story of Josiah in Chronicles can serve as a witness to that community and its construction of the past (whatever the historicity of the presentation). This thesis, therefore, will analyze the Chr's literary and ideological construction of the Josiah narrative, its perspective(s), and consider the possible insight this provides on the community that wrote and received this text.

1.2 Assumptions

One of the advantages of working in Chronicles, as opposed to other texts in the HB, is that a nearly universal consensus has emerged on some of the basic assumptions about the text and its history. It is generally agreed that Chronicles was composed, using Samuel-Kings and other biblical books, in Jerusalem, within the temple community, separately from Ezra-Nehemiah, in the Achaemenid Persian period, probably in the mid- to late fourth century.[13]

In addition to these assumptions regarding the text and its context, there are three important points to make about my assumptions in the exegesis and analysis of the Josiah

---

[13] On the use of Samuel-Kings, the relationship of Chronicles to Ezra-Nehemiah, and the precise date in the Persian period, some notable, though clearly minority, opinions persist. On these minority opinions, in addition to the introductions and bibliographies provided in most leading commentaries on Chronicles, see the excellent introduction by William Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History* (eds. David Clines and Philip R. Davies; JSOTSup 160; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 15-36.

narrative in Chronicles: (1) this is a final form analysis of Chronicles, (2) by Chr, I mean an implied author of this final form text, and (3) by the Chr's community, I mean the community in which and for whom this final form text was written, read, and re-read.[14]

Although the suggestions of early forms of the text, e.g. 1 Chr 10–2 Chr 32, and multiple redactions are certainly plausible, it is my assumption in this study that the MT of Chronicles, or something very near to it, is a text that probably circulated in and belonged to a particular community already in the Persian period.[15] It is this final form text and its primary community that interests me. This study, therefore, does not explore possible redactional stages in the text's development but gives priority to the MT of Chronicles as the most reliable extant Hebrew witness to the final form text.

My interest in the final form text and its primary community, in turn, largely inspires my recourse to the theory of implied authorship. The anonymity and inaccessibility of the real historical author(s) of Chronicles as well as uncertainty regarding the text's potential redactional history makes it difficult, if not impossible, to reconstruct real authorial intention. Furthermore, it is not only possible but very likely that the real historical author(s) did not intend to communicate everything that was received by the reader(s) nor were they fully aware of all the implications of their words. Given this, it is more appropriate to write about an implied author—inferred from the final form text, temporally located with the text in the late Persian period, and responsible for the whole text. In referring to this implied author, who is a projection from the final form text, it is

---

[14] It is important to clarify that by Chr's community, I only mean the immediate community in which the text was written, which does not, in my opinion, comprise the sole audience for the book of Chronicles (see chapter 5).

[15] In addition to the internal evidence that suggests that the MT text reflects a final form text from the late Persian period, the LXX, other extant translations, and the writings of Josephus presume a text like the MT of Chronicles. Unfortunately, there is only one small fragment of Chronicles extant among the Qumran Scrolls. On the relationship of the LXX Chronicles to the MT Chronicles, see Leslie C. Allen, "Further Thoughts on an Old Recension of Reigns in Paralipomena," *HTR* 61 (1968): 483-491; *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Masoretic Text* (2 vols.; VTSup 25, 27; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974).

my purpose to consider the whole text as "intentional" discourse, at least to the extent that every word is relevant to the creation of meaning and exegesis.[16]

Though the Chr, as such, is not a "real" person, this implied author is activated by real readers. In this thesis, I am interested in those particular readers for whom the final form text was originally composed, which was likely the immediate community to which the real author(s) of Chronicles belonged. Consequently, I refer to this community as the Chr's community. Only in this limited and very specific context am I referring to the real author(s) of Chronicles and only then to designate their community.

Admittedly, this community is primarily known through the text because, unfortunately, the state of present knowledge on the Persian period Jewish community of Yehud that produced the final form text of Chronicles is minimal.[17] Nevertheless, some archaeological and sociological research does provide general observations relevant to the reconstruction of this community; some of this research, while not the focus of my analysis, is implicit in it. Based on the text and this research, the community was likely a religious community, circa late fourth century, for whom the Torah was authoritative, who resided in Jerusalem, likely centred in the Temple,

---

[16] By this, I do not mean to exclude the possibility of latency or sub-texts within the text. Rather, I only mean to reject a methodology that would dismiss in an interpretation of the text certain words, phrases, or even passages and chapters on the basis of some notion of real authorial intention.

[17] On this issue and others relating to Achaemenid Yehud, see Michael Avi-Yonah, *The Holy Land: From the Persian to the Arab Conquests (536 B.C. to A.D. 640): A Historical Geography* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966); Jon L. Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow: A Social and Historical Approach* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995); John W. Betlyon, "The Provincial Government of Persian Period Judea and the Yehud Coins," *JBL* 105 (1986): 633-642; Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Temple and Society in Achaemenid Judah" in *Second Temple Studies 1; Persian Period* (ed. Philip R. Davies; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 22-53; Charles E. Carter, *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study* (eds. David Clines and Philip R. Davies; JSOTSup 294; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (2 vols.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); Kenneth G. Hoglund, "The Achaemenid Context" in *Second Temple Studies 1: Persian Period* (ed. Philip R. Davies; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 54-72; Oded Lipschits, "Demographic Changes in Judah between the 7th and the 5th Centuries BCE" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (ed. Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 323-376; Joachim Schaper, "The Jerusalem Temple as an Instrument of the Achaemenid Fiscal Administration," *VT* 45 (1995): 528-539; Daniel L. Smith, "The Politics of Ezra: Sociological Indicators of Postexilic Judaean Society" in *Second Temple Studies 1: The Persian Period* (ed. Philip R. Davies; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 73-97; James M. Trotter, "Was the Second Jerusalem Temple a Primarily Persian Project?," *SJOT* 15 (2001): 276-294.

responsible for the religious (and perhaps also civil) education of Yehudites, copied, wrote, re-wrote, read, and re-read religious texts (including most biblical texts), interacted with other current Yahwistic/Elohistic religious communities, and operated under the (direct or indirect) auspices of the Persian government.

Despite the relative significance of this community within Jerusalem, Yehud, and possibly among some diaspora Yahwistic/Elohistic communities, the political authority of the community was probably quite limited; that is, the promulgation of civil law was almost certainly restricted to a civil authority, the Governor of the Province of Yehud, with whom this community may or may not have had influence (depending on the political situation at a given time). Moreover, they were certainly an insignificant community to the Persian Great Kings; their only access to the Persian Court would have been by way of whatever rights were afforded to subject peoples, e.g. limited rights of appeal for military and economic aid and legal grievances. Still, this community, in spite or despite its relative insignificance within the Persian Empire, constructed itself, Jerusalem, and the Temple as the central authorities of the Yahwistic religious tradition and, in this respect, understood itself at the center of the world.

1.3 Methodology

My methodological approach in this thesis is an amalgam of several techniques and critical methods. The text is an historical artefact that the scholar needs to analyze and contextualize: first, by examining its structure, second, by considering its content and purpose, and third, by considering the context and function that it claims for itself. Thus, in chapter two, my analysis of the Josiah narrative starts with an examination of the various structural techniques of the text: patterns of repetition, chronological and temporal markers, scenes and sequences. In chapters three and four, my analysis continues with a close look at the content and purpose of

the narrative. In chapter five, my analysis concludes with a consideration of the community in which and for whom the text was written and read, i.e. the context and function of the narrative.

Philosophically, my methodology is most immediately affected by the approaches and interests of my professors, Francis Landy and Ehud Ben Zvi. From them, I have adopted an appreciation for close readings that use traditional exegetical strategies most frequently associated with New Criticism, Form Criticism, Rhetorical Criticism, and Structuralism.[18] From Dr. Landy, in particular, I have gained an appreciation for postmodern approaches as well as developed a passion for literary analysis in biblical studies by such scholars as Fokkelman and Sternberg.[19] By contrast, Dr. Ben Zvi has significantly influenced my methodology with his own reader-centred approach, which is an innovative exegetical and historical-critical technique that attempts to reconstruct the primary community and its concerns on the basis of the text and its possible readings and re-readings.[20] Dr. Ben Zvi has also encouraged in me a healthy skepticism for postmodern approaches, which always serves to temper my occasional recourse to their work.

To these methodologies and philosophical traditions, I also must admit my own convictions as a Christian who seeks to empathize with the text, its implied author(s) and the communities that received them. I am undeniably committed to a Christian, yet critical and academic, approach to the text that seeks to understand the text not only for its insight(s) on the past but also its potential applications to the present. This approach means that I work with the

---

[18] See the introductions and bibliography on these approaches in Norman C. Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament* (GBS; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971); Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes, *To Each its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and their Application* (Rev ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 58-89, 156-229; Mark A. Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (GBS; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990); Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah* (GBS; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994).

[19] See the introductions and bibliography on these approaches in A. K. M. Adam, *What is Postmodern Biblical Criticism?* (GBS; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995); Gina Hens-Piazza, *The New Historicism* (GBS; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002); McKenzie and Haynes, *To Each its Own Meaning*, 253-267, and refer to my bibliography for the works that specifically impacted my thought on this thesis.

[20] See esp. Ehud Ben Zvi, *Micah* (FOTL 21B; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), passim; *Signs of Jonah: Reading and Rereading in Ancient Yehud* (JSOTSup 367; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), passim.

text under the conviction that the text is part of a canon of sacred literature with authority in my life and the life of the contemporary Christian community. Nevertheless, I strive to approach the text free from any dogmatic presuppositions about the nature of the text, apart from its inclusion in a canon, or the religious worldview expressed therein.

This conviction, in my opinion, does not compromise my research results but rather aids them. The author and community of Chronicles were people of faith who, like me, appear to have recognized a canon, or at least collection, of sacred literature. As such, though their religious practices were no doubt very different from my own, I share with them what is perhaps the most important aim of their endeavors: through the study of sacred texts, come to a deeper knowledge of our God, who we believe desires a relationship with us and has acted for us in the past and continues to act in the present. This aim must, in my opinion, be taken into consideration in any reading of the biblical texts that attempts to reflect on their meaning and function within the primary communities that received them.

Chapter 2

The Literary Technique: Structure and Form of the Narrative

The tendency to search for one authentic structure in Hebrew narratives is profoundly misguided. In the absence of a completely developed system of punctuation or an extensive use of titles, headings, and superscriptions, biblical writers used various structural techniques within the narrative itself to create structure. This system is much more fluid and flexible than, e.g., the rigid academic forms used in this thesis. In the Josiah narrative, the Chr employs several of these structural techniques to create a tapestry of overlapping and interconnected units: (a) patterns of repetition, (b) chronological or temporal markers, and (c) scenes and sequences.[21]

2.1 Patterns of Repetition

Repetition is a universal and essential phenomenon of communication. Repetition can operate on the syntagmatic axis, concerned with the syntax of linguistic units, or the paradigmatic axis, concerned with the form and signification within linguistic units. Although participants in a communication are not always consciously aware of all types of repetition operating in a given discourse, it is nevertheless fundamental to the process and meaning; repetition is used to construct, organize, emphasize, compare, and contrast coherent discourse. Linguists have uncovered and classified many types of repetition that serve a wide range of

---

[21] This structural analysis is concerned with identifying unit structure rather than sentence structure or phonemic structure. Some techniques in discussion, however, operate on multiple levels, instances of which are mentioned, in some cases, in the discussion or in the footnotes.

Throughout the structural analysis, it is often necessary to articulate the variety of forms in use throughout the narrative and as such this analysis can be said to address both structure and form in the narrative.

purposes; not all types of repetition are found in all languages, though there is considerable common ground, and some types are more keenly developed within certain groups or corpora than in others.[22] In biblical literature, there are several common types of repetition: inclusio, key words or phrases, concentricity, resumption, chiasmus, palistrophe, redundancy, formal or grammatical repetition, sound repetition, and so on.[23] In the Josiah narrative, the Chr prominently employs inclusio and key words or phrases as well as concentricity.[24]

2.1.1 Inclusio

One of the simplest and most documented structural techniques in narrative prose is inclusio, which is the use of parallel phrases at the start and end of a unit.[25] These parallel phrases, using shared phraseology or motifs, function as an introduction and a conclusion that defines and circumscribes the extent of a narrative unit. The parallels establish for readers the main subject or context for a narrative at the outset and then summarize, or recapitulate, these at the end in order to ensure that readers clearly perceive an important aspect of the enclosed narrative. In this type of composition, the parallel phrases are an intimate part of the narrative that they govern.[26] This technique appears nine times in the Josiah narrative to define units.

---

[22] For a convenient overview of this research and relevant bibliography, see Philip A. Quick, "Taxonomy of Repetition," *Notes* 114 (1986): 15-26.

[23] Following Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible* (eds. David Clines et al.; trans. Shimon Bar-Efrat and Dorothea Shefer-Vanson; JSOTSup 70; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989; repr., 1992), 98n92 and Luis Alonso Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics* (SubBi 11; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988), 192, I regard chiasmus as an ABBA pattern while concentricity exhibits an ABXBA pattern.

It is beyond the scope of this analysis to account for all the different types of repetition, especially the numerous varieties of parallelism that appear most frequently in Hebrew poetry.

[24] The Chr also embeds chiasmus (e.g. 34:4a; verb-object-object-verb) and other creative grammatical arrangements (e.g. 34:4b, three nouns followed by three verbs; 35:3-6, seven consecutive imperatives) in ways that relate less to unit structure and more to sentence structure and style.

[25] The technique is also called inclusion, envelope, or sandwich structure.

[26] As opposed to resumptive repetition, another framing technique, where the parallel phrases are not an intimate part of the enclosed narrative but rather the second parallel statement represents a return to the narrative

In Chronicles, most regnal reports are circumscribed at the outermost limits by a somewhat peculiar, transitional type of inclusio. This type of inclusio consists of succession formulas that provide the essential skeleton for the entire book. The basic form of the succession formulas is a death and burial notice and/or a closing regnal resume of the king followed by the phrase "and X, his son, was king after him" (וימלך X בנו תחתיו) where "X" is the name of the successor.[27] With one exception in Chronicles, this formula fulfills a dual function to conclude the reign of the succeeded and introduce the reign of the successor.[28] It is, therefore, peculiar in that it is an intimate part of two units and contributes to an inclusio frame for each regnal report. It also permits readers to bypass the reigns of individual kings without disruption to the succession of kings that forms the fundamental framework of Chronicles while at the same time invites readers to a new narrative thread concerning a new king. In the case of Josiah, readers can move from the succession formula in 33:25 to the formula in 36:1 and remain aware that Josiah succeeded Amon and Jehoahaz succeeded Josiah or they can choose to read the Josiah narrative. In this way then, the Chr demarcates the outermost limits of the Josiah narrative.

While not explicitly linked on the syntagmatic axis, customary opening and closing regnal summations—a paradigmatic convention used to envelop nearly all regnal reports—frame and govern the narrative unit enclosed by the parallel succession formulas. These summations in 34:1-2 and 35:26-27 provide necessary terms of reference for the events of Josiah's reign. The opening summation introduces the Josiah narrative proper (2 Chr 34–35) by informing the reader

---

thread that ended in the first statement. In this case, the enclosed narrative represents a digression, however essential, to the narrative from which it is set apart. On resumptive repetition in biblical narrative, see Burke O. Long, "Framing Repetitions in Biblical Historiography," *JBL* 106, no. 3 (1987): 385-399; Philip A. Quick, "Resumptive Repetition: A Two-Edged Sword," *JOTT* 6 (1993): 289-316; Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Presentation of Synchroneity and Simultaneity in Biblical Narratives" in *Studies in Hebrew Narrative Art throughout the Ages* (ed. Joseph Heinemann and Shmuel Werses; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1978), 9-26.

[27] See section A.1 for a complete list of all occurrences of this succession formula and its variant forms.

[28] The exception is the succession formula in 1 Chr 29:28, which reports the death of David and the succession of Solomon. In this case though, the succession formula is followed by a reference to additional sources (1 Chr 29:29-30) rather than the start of Solomon's reign (2 Chr 1:1).

of Josiah's age at ascension and the length of his reign in 34:1 and providing an evaluation of the king in 34:2. The closing summation concludes the narrative with an appeal to a more exhaustive source that the Chr claims recounts the rest of Josiah's "faithful deeds" (35:26-27). Through this appeal, whether simply a literary convention, a deliberate fabrication, or an authentic source citation, the Chr acknowledges the selectivity of the narrative, makes a claim for its representational authority, and reinforces the positive evaluation of the king in 34:2 of the opening summation.

The seven other inclusios frame major and minor units within the Josiah narrative: 34:2b//33b frame the details of Josiah's reforms;[29] 34:3b//5b//7b frame the purge in Jerusalem, Judah, northern Israel, and Simeon; 34:8//35:19 frame the events in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign; 35:1//19, 35:1//17, 35:17//19, and 35:10//16 frame the Passover report and stages in it.

1. 34:2 וילך בדרכי דויד אביו ולא־סר ימין ושמאול
"and he walked in the ways of David his father and did not turn aside right or left"

34:33 כל־ימיו לא סרו מאחרי יהוה אלהי אבותיהם
"all his days, they did not turn aside from after Yahweh, the god of their fathers"

These parallel statements are the frame for Josiah's reforms. The statements are coupled by common wording, לא־סר//לא סרו ("he did not turn aside"//"they did not turn aside") and אביו//אבותיהם ("his father"//"their fathers"). The Chr reports in 34:2b that Josiah was faithful to

[29] Simon J. De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (FOTL 11; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 407, argues "the reference in v. 8 to the purging of temple and land forms another inclusio with v. 33b." I fail to see any substantial parallels between 34:8 and 34:33b. A stronger argument for an inclusio is made by Barrick, *King and Cemeteries*, 25; Raymond B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles* (WBC 15; Waco: Word Books, 1987), 282; Lyle Eslinger, "Josiah and the Torah Book: Comparison of 2 Kgs 22:1-23:28 and 2 Chr 34:1-35:19," *HAR* 10 (1986): 50, who point out that 34:33a encapsulates 34:3b-7. However, while there is a summative relationship, there are no shared expressions. As such, it seems more prudent to regard 34:2b and 34:33b, which share a common vocabulary, as the inclusio that frames the reforms in their totality.

the ways of his father and that he did not turn aside from these ways. In the parallel phrase of 34:33b, the Chr describes the faithfulness of the people who, in all the days of their king, do not turn aside from Yahweh, god of their fathers. The framed narrative, therefore, shares a common theme of faithfulness to ancestral practices and so may be seen as a report of the process by which the king's faithfulness becomes the people's faithfulness; the narrative consists of the events by which Josiah affects national reform.

2. 34:3 החל לטהר את־יהודה וירושלם
"and he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem"

34:5 ויטהר את־יהודה ואת־ירושלם
"and he purged Judah and Jerusalem"

34:7 וישב לירושלם
"and he returned to Jerusalem"

At first, the inclusio of 34:3b and 34:5b seems simple and straightforward. The action that begins in 34:3b with "he began to purge" (החל לטהר) is brought to completion in 34:5b with "he purged" (ויטהר); the framed narrative sets out the steps taken to bring the initiated action to successful completion. The completion of the action in Judah and Jerusalem, however, is a false conclusion to the pericope as immediately 34:6 introduces an addendum that widens the sphere of action initiated in 34:3b to include tribal territories outside Judah and Jerusalem. The addendum and so the entire unit reaches its conclusion in 34:7b with the statement that Josiah returned to Jerusalem. The threefold repetition of Jerusalem (ירושלם) binds the narrative elements into one unified pericope.

3. 34:8 ובשנה שמונה עשרה למלכו
"and in the eighteenth year of his reign"

35:19 בשמונה עשרה שנה למלכות יאשיהו
"in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign"

The inclusio that encircles events of the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign starts a new narrative in 34:8 in the middle of the unit from 34:2b to 34:33b and extends beyond that unit into the next chapter to encase the report of the Passover (35:1-19), creating overlap between two narrative units.

This unit is the largest within the Josiah narrative. In contrast to the other inclusios in the narrative, the parallel statements that form this inclusio are simply re-statements that define a temporal context for the events that they envelop (see section 2.2). The second statement does not introduce new information or bring an action initiated to completion. Nevertheless, the Chr stylizes the parallels with an alternate grammatical form of the date and the addition of the king's name in the second statement.

4, 5, 6.	35:1	ויעש יאשיהו בירושלם פסח ליהוה ... בארבעה עשר לחדש הראשון "and Josiah performed in Jerusalem a Passover to Yahweh ... on the fourteenth day of the first month"
	35:17	ויעשו בני־ישראל הנמצאים את־הפסח בעת ההיא "and the sons of Israel who were present performed the Passover at that time"
	35:19	בשמונה עשרה שנה למלכות יאשיהו נעשה הפסח הזה "in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, this Passover was performed"

These statements in the Passover report (35:1-19) can create three different inclusios: 35:1 can link with either 35:17 or 35:19 to envelop the Passover report with or without the evaluation (35:17-19) while 35:17 links with 35:19 to enclose the evaluation.[30] All three statements share a common verb "to perform" (עשה) and noun "Passover" (פסח) and also

[30] Significantly, 35:16 also shares common language with 35:1//17//19. The phrase "on that day" (ביום ההוא) functions like the phrase "at that time" (בעת ההיא) in 35:17 as a back-reference to 35:1 and the phrase "to perform the Passover" shares the common verb "to perform" (עשה) and noun "Passover" (פסח) that link the statements in 35:1//17//19. By contrast, however, these phrases are subordinate to the main clause; the verb, in particular, occurs in the infinitive. The links, therefore, seem to function more as a transition to 35:17 rather than as an inclusio with 35:1 (see section 2.1.2.2), though as argued below, 35:16 is a part of an inclusio with 35:10.

include temporal markers: the fourteenth day of the first month (בארבעה עשר לחדש הראשון), "at that time" (בעת ההיא), and "the eighteenth year" (בשמונה עשרה שנה). The incredible flexibility of biblical structure is especially evident here in that 35:17 can function as the conclusio to one inclusio (35:1//17) and the introduction to another (35:17//19) while 35:19 can function as the conclusio to three inclusios (34:8//35:19, 35:1//19, 35:17//19).

While these statements are essentially concerned to call attention to the performance of the Passover, there is a significant conceptual development. In the first statement, Josiah is the performer of the Passover while in the second "the sons of Israel who were present" are the active subject; this is identical to the way in which the inclusio of 34:2b//3b juxtaposes Josiah's faithfulness in 34:2b with the people's faithfulness in 34:33b. The third parallel, which may link with either 35:1 or 35:17, is a passive construction that relates only that the Passover was performed; in contrast to either 35:1 or 35:17, this stresses the performance of the Passover apart from any active subject. This conceptual development is more developed when considered in concert with two other statements in 35:17 and 35:18 that share the common language (see section 2.3.2.1).

Also, as readily apparent, the date formulas are not equivalent in content but are interrelated and, in the case of 35:1 and 35:19, supply complementary information in a parallel form: the first date formula communicates the day and month, the second relies on the first for meaning, while the third reinforces the year (already mentioned in 34:8).

7. 35:10 ותכון העבודה ... כמצות המלך
"and the service was prepared ... according to the command of the king"

35:16 ותכון כל־עבודת יהוה ... כמצות המלך יאשיהו
"and all the service of Yahweh was prepared ... according to the command of the king Josiah"

The Passover service proper is enclosed by these parallel statements in 35:10 and 35:16. These statements essentially declare the same thing, namely that the service was prepared

according to the command of the king. There is no new information per se or any conceptual development in the parallel statements and, in this respect, this inclusio resembles the temporal inclusio for the eighteenth year (34:8//35:19). Even so, the statement in 35:16 amplifies and so emphatically reinforces the statement of 35:10.

2.3.2 Key Words and Phrases

In any written document (or parts of it), there are always words that appear more frequently than others. The particular words that appear more often are primarily a reflection of the subject matter of the document (or parts of it) and the author's vocabulary. When there are unique or rare words in a given document or when there is a high concentration of certain words, these words are known as key words because they provide a key to the structure, organization, themes or motifs, and topic of a document (or parts of it). Key words or phrases can be used to promote cohesion within a unit or establish transitional links between units.

2.3.2.1 Cohesion

There are several words that clearly have a unique importance or appear with greater frequency in 2 Chr 34–35 than in most other parts of the Bible. These words include the names of characters in these chapters, such as Josiah, Shaphan, Hilkiah, Huldah, and Neco, and a high concentration of references to the Passover or paschal offerings (פסח), documents or books (ספר), and the Levites (לוי), relative to the HB as a whole. These key words provide some indication of the major concerns in the Josiah narrative, bind the Josiah narrative together as a discrete unit, and set it apart from the narrative that surrounds it.

This technique of using key words to identify structural units can also be applied to smaller units within the Josiah narrative. In some cases, there are key words or key phrases that

are highly concentrated in parts of the Josiah narrative, provide some narrative cohesion to these parts, and so help to shape distinct units. In the report of the temple repairs (34:8-13), e.g., "temple" (בית) occurs seven times, reinforcing the setting in the temple and the repairs on the temple. In the report of the covenant ceremony (34:29-33), "all" (כל) repeats eleven times in just five verses, emphasizing the collective and total commitment of the participants. In the report of Josiah's purge (34:3b-7) and the Passover account (35:1-19), there are even more complex uses of key words and phrases.[31]

1. 34:3 הבמות והאשרים והפסלים והמסכות
"the high places and the asherim and the graven images and the molten images"

34:4 והאשרים והפסלים והמסכות
"and the asherim and the graven images and the molten images"

34:7 והאשרים והפסלים
"and the asherim and the graven images"

The unit of 34:3b-7 consists of three parts: the initial introductory statement (34:3), the purge in Judah and Jerusalem (34:4-5), and the purge in the periphery (34:6-7). The summary statement functions as a sort of programme for the other two parts by cataloguing the idolatrous objects to be purged. The repetition of objects in the programme, as they are destroyed in Josiah's purge of Judah, Jerusalem, and the periphery, complemented by the three-part inclusio of 34:3b//5b//7b, strengthens the cohesion of the narrative unit.

Only two of the four idolatrous objects listed in 34:3, however, appear in all three places in the narrative. "The molten images" (המסכות) are referred to only once more in 34:4 as a

---

[31] פסח ("Passover, paschal sacrifice, or Pesach") occurs thirteen times in eleven of the nineteen verses that comprise the Passover account. This represents roughly 17.6% of the seventy-four occurrences of פסח ("Passover, paschal sacrifice, or Pesach") in the HB (24.5% of the nominal occurrences and 26.5% of the nominal occurrences, excluding the proper name) and an overwhelming 65% of the twenty occurrences of פסח ("Passover, paschal sacrifice, or Pesach") in Chronicles (68.4%, excluding the proper name in 1 Chr 4:12). It is more than double the occurrences of פסח ("Passover, paschal sacrifice, or Pesach") in the report of Hezekiah's Passover, where it appears six times.

target of Josiah's purge in Judah and Jerusalem; there is no mention of their destruction in the periphery nor does the Chr make reference to an equivalent. "The high places" (הבמות) are not mentioned again at all, though perhaps the Chr specifically names the high places in Judah and Jerusalem as "the altars of the Baals" (מזבחות הבעלים) and "incense altars" (החמנים) and in the periphery as "the altars" (מזבחות) and "incense altars" (החמנים).[32] In any case, the repetition of "the altars" and the "incense altars," whether an expansion of the high places or not, help to maintain the cohesion of the unit too. The verb "to purge" (טהר), present in the inclusio statements that envelop this unit, should also be regarded as a key word that imposes unit cohesion.

2. 35:1 ויעש יאשיהו בירושלם פסח ליהוה ... בארבעה עשר לחדש הראשון
"and Josiah performed in Jerusalem a Passover to Yahweh ... on the fourteenth day of the first month"

35:16 לעשות הפסח ... כמצות המלך יאשיהו
"to perform the Passover ... according to the command of the king, Josiah"

35:17 ויעשו בני־ישראל הנמצאים את־הפסח בעת ההיא
"and the sons of Israel who were present performed the Passover at that time"

35:18 ולא נעשה פסח כמהו בישראל מימי שמואל הנביא
"and a Passover like this one was not performed in Israel from the days of Samuel the prophet"

וכל מלכי ישראל לא עשו כפסח אשר עשה יאשיהו והכהנים והלוים וכל יהודה וישראל הנמצא ויושבי ירושלם
"and all the kings of Israel did not perform such a Passover as Josiah and the priests and the Levites and all Judah and Israel who were present and the inhabitants of Jerusalem performed"

35:19 בשמונה עשרה שנה למלכות יאשיהו נעשה הפסח הזה
"in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, this Passover was performed"

---

[32] Alternatively, Barrick, *King and Cemeteries*, 20, contends that this reflects the "diminished ideological importance of the bamoth issue in Chronicles generally." See also Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (2nd rev. ed.; BEATAJ 9; New York: P. Lang, 1997), 217-221.

All six of these statements share key words with the root "to perform" (עשה) and the noun "Passover" (פסח). In 35:1, the Chr uses the *qal* singular "he performed" (יעש) with Josiah as subject and the Passover as object. In 35:16, the Chr uses the *qal* infinitive "to perform" (לעשות) with the Passover as object. In 35:17 and 35:18b, the Chr uses the *qal* plural "they performed" (יעשו) with the Israelite community and members in that community as the subjects and the Passover as object. In 35:18a and 35:19, the Chr employs the *nip'al* perfect singular "it was performed" (נעשה) with the Passover as subject, which suitably places the final emphasis not on any performer(s) but on the performance itself. The common verb is negated in the two statements in 35:18, which stresses the incomparability of this Passover. The concentration of the repetition in 35:17-19, in particular, stresses the cohesion of the evaluation as a discrete unit.

3. 35:1 וישחטו הפסח
"and they slaughtered the paschal sacrifice"

35:6 ושחטו הפסח
"and slaughter the paschal sacrifice"

35:11 וישחטו הפסח
"and they slaughtered the paschal sacrifice"

The Chr uses nearly identical phrases built on the noun "the paschal sacrifice" (הפסח) and verbs with the root "to slaughter" (שחט) three times in the Passover account. In 35:1, the phrase is a part of the summary statement that introduces the Passover and the date on which it took place. In 35:6, the verb occurs in the imperative and together with the noun constitutes a part of the extensive commands given by Josiah to the Levites. In 35:11, the verb appears in the *qal* form, as in 34:1, to communicate the slaughter of the paschal offerings within the sequence of events in the Passover service. Each occurrence of the phrase, therefore, has a distinct function within the Passover report and, in effect, builds on the previous occurrence in a pattern of summary → command → fulfillment. The key words also have a resumptive function (see n26)

in that they constantly focus the reader back onto the main subject of the narrative, that is the Passover, after digressions in the intervening verses.

4. 35:4 [והכונו [והכינו
"and make preparations"

35:6 והכינו לאחיכם
"and make preparations for your brothers"

35:10 ותכון העבודה
"and the service was prepared"

35:14 ואחר הכינו להם ולכהנים
"and after, they made preparations for themselves and for the priests"

35:14 והלוים הכינו להם ולכהנים
"and the Levites made preparations for themselves and for the priests"

35:15 כי־אחיהם הלוים הכינו להם
"because their brothers the Levites made preparations for them"

35:16 ותכון כל־עבודת
"and all the service was prepared"

In the Passover account, there is also a high concentration of verbs with the root "to prepare" (כון), predominantly used with respect to the preparations made by the Levites on behalf of other Levites and the priests (accounting for five of the eight occurrences). The first occurrence of the verb is in 35:4 and constitutes the imperative in Josiah's command that the Levites prepare themselves according to their family houses and divisions. The preparations for the other Levites and priests are given as a subsequent command by Josiah in 35:6, a command that the Levites are reported to have executed in 35:14 and 15. The fulfillment of the command is actually reported three times: twice in 35:14 with respect to the priests and once in 35:15 with respect to the gatekeepers. The nearly identical phrases that open and close 35:14 are an example of resumptive repetition (see n26) on a sub-unit level and frame a digression that explains the reason for the preparations made by the Levites on behalf of the priests. The parallel

statements in 35:10 and 35:16 have already been considered as an inclusio that defines 35:10-16 as a unit.

2.3.2.2 Transition

Key words and phrases do not only provide inter-unit cohesion. They can also provide intra-unit cohesion. By employing a key word or phrase from a preceding unit near the outset of a subsequent unit (often in a subordinate clause), an author can create a smooth transition from one unit to another and emphasize some sort of relationship between the two units.[33] This technique is variously known as tail-head transition, tail-head linkage, back-reference, recapitulation, chaining, or linking.[34] The Chr employs this variant of the key words or phrases technique in three instances.

In 34:8, a subordinate clause follows the eighteenth year marker and presents the forthcoming events as a continuation of the purge described in 34:3b-7. The use of "to purge" טהר, a key verbal form in the inclusio that encases 34:3b-7, provides the transition and establishes a relationship between the units.

In 34:14, the Chr uses a subordinate, temporal clause with a nearly identical phrase from the preceding unit (specifically 34:9) to introduce a roughly contemporaneous event. The nearly identical phrases are את־הכסף המובא בית־אלהים//את־הכסף המובא בית יהוה ("the money that was brought to the house of God"//" the money that was brought to the house of Yahweh").

---

[33] The key word does not usually occur again in the new unit after this initial transitional usage. Also, as parenthetically noted above, the key word or phrase is typically used in a secondary position to the main information that introduces the new unit. These two aspects of the technique preserve the distinctiveness of the two units.

[34] See Quick, "Resumptive Repetition," 293-294. This technique does not always rely on or use key words and phrases. Sometimes back-reference is signaled by a subordinate clause comprised of a relative temporal marker and a summary of an event (word or action). The summary may or may not use a key word of the previous unit, e.g. cf. 35:20, which uses key words, and 34:14, which does not.

The phrase in 34:14 refers back to the temple repairs in order to highlight the synchroneity of events.[35]

There is another instance of back-reference in 35:20 in the subordinate clause, "when Josiah had prepared the temple" (אשר הכין יאשיהו את־הבית), which is in apposition to the relative temporal clause "after all this" (אחרי כל־זאת). In this case, the verb "to prepare" (כון), a key word in the Passover report, comes forward from the previous unit and so establishes a relationship between the units. Additionally, the use of the word "temple" (בית), although a common term, may evoke 34:8-13, where, as mentioned, the word is heavily concentrated in the Josiah narrative. Alternatively, the use of "to prepare" (כון) and "temple" (בית), as a means of recalling the first and the last narratives of the eighteenth year, may suggest that the Chr wants to reference all the events in Josiah's eighteenth year, a notion that is reinforced by the particle "all" (כל) in the temporal clause. In any case, there are several contextual and ideological issues at play in this back-reference that are explored in the next two chapters.

2.3.3 Concentricity

The Chr uses a concentric structure in the Josiah narrative to style the report of the repairs to the temple, the discovery of the book of the law and its presentation to the king, the king's response, the inquiry with Huldah, and the covenant renewal ceremony. The pattern starts and ends in the temple, revelations immediately follow and precede the respective temple scenes, and the pattern reaches its climax with the king's response at the focal point of the narrative:

---

[35] Eslinger, "Josiah and the Torah Book," 37.

A. Repairs for the Temple (34:8-13)

B. The Book of the Law (34:14-18)

X. The King's Response (34:19-21)

B'. Huldah and Her Oracle (34:22-28)

A'. Covenant in the Temple (34:29-33a)

The parallel opening and closing set, consisting primarily of exposition, not only share the same setting in the temple but also loosely share the theme of restoration. The opening scene concerns the restoration of the temple while the closing scene concerns the restoration of the covenant of the people, king, and god. The parallel revelations juxtapose the book of the law with the prophetic voice of Huldah and largely consist of direct speech. The panels also share a common sequence of command → fulfillment → report. The king's faithful response is the critical climax upon which the concentric structure turns and, like the B-B' pair, consists primarily of direct speech. Other elements too, discussed in section 2.5, reinforce the cohesion of the unit and the relationship of these panels.

The structure follows a prototypical plot sequence of complication, rising action, climax, falling action, and resolution while parallel forms, settings, and themes highlight a correspondence in the respective scenes leading from the initial complication to the central climax and those scenes falling from the central climax to the denouement. The sophistication of the concentric structure sets this section apart from the surrounding units, which are comparatively simpler in structure. This sophistication reflects the heightened level of the narrative discourse. The Chr shifts from the economy of the purge and its almost pedantic banality to a fully developed story with multiple characters, characterization, action and suspense, a dramatic climax, and a resolution.

2.2 Chronological or Temporal Markers

Chronological and temporal markers are a common structural device and yet their importance as structural devices and their influence on the reading process from a purely literary standpoint is sometimes overlooked by biblical critics; instead scholars tend to analyze these chronological and temporal markers for their historicity or ideological significance.[36] The recent work of Louis Jonker on the Chr's Josiah narrative, informed by the theoretical framework of Hardmeier's pragmatic-rhetorical approach, however, has shown the value of a careful analysis of chronological and temporal markers for understanding narrative structure and the reading process, especially as a critical precursor to an analysis of their ideological importance.[37]

There are two types of temporal markers in the Josiah narrative that help to define unit structure:[38] (1) specific markers identifying particular units of time (e.g. real numbers and dates) and (2) non-specific markers providing relative temporal contexts (e.g. "on, at, in" ב or "after" אחר).[39] Both types of temporal markers set out the order of the story and so contribute to a frame for the plot. They collapse or expand narrative time in order to affect the temporal contiguity between narrated events and also can create a sense of verisimilitude between the world of the narrative and the actual world, narrative chronology and actual chronology.

---

[36] On this approach to the chronological and temporal markers in the Josiah narrative, see esp. Cogan, "Chronicler's Use of Chronology",197-210.

[37] Louis Jonker, "The Pragmatic-Rhetorical Function of Temporal Organization in Old Testament Narratives: The Case of the Chronicler's Portrayal of King Josiah" (paper presented at the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Cambridge, UK, July 2003); Jonker, *Reflections*, 15-25. My analysis of chronology and time in the Josiah story comes out of my original, independent research, subsequently informed by Jonker's work. My organization of the chronological and temporal markers differs in several respects from Jonker's analysis; even so, where my analysis draws on Jonker's work, I have noted it. Also, I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Jonker for helping me to acquire his monograph, which, at the time, was unavailable in North America.

[38] In addition to temporal markers that have a structural purpose, there are three temporal markers in 34:33 ("all his days" כל־ימיו), 35:18 ("from the days of Samuel the prophet" מימי שמואל הנביא), and 35:25 ("until today" עד־היום) that do not define unit structure. They do, however, provide information and evaluation of a temporal nature that is significant to the ideology of the narrative(s), which I explore in the next chapter.

[39] cf. Jonker, *Reflections*, 16-20, who uses the categories "macro-structural" and "sub-structural" to organize the temporal markers.

The first temporal marker in the Josiah narrative is the regnal summary (34:1), which builds on the regnal summaries of the other preceding kings in order to situate Josiah's reign in a specific point in time. The marker provides the reader with Josiah's age at his ascension (eight years old) and the length of this reign (thirty-one years). The subsequent temporal markers, specific and non-specific, depend on these critical terms of reference in order to build a meaningful chronology for the entire regnal report.

Soon after the regnal summary and evaluation, the Chr employs three more temporal markers in relatively quick succession; they are references to the eighth (34:3a), the twelfth (34:3b), and the eighteenth years (34:8) of Josiah's reign. On the basis of the regnal summary, it is possible to determine that Josiah is sixteen, twenty, and twenty-six years old respectively in these regnal years.

The description of the events in the eighth year is brief, limited only to a statement of Josiah's emerging piety. The Chr also informs the reader that in the eighth year Josiah was still a "youth" (נער).[40] In the twelfth year, which would seem to represent Josiah's coming-of-age, Josiah begins to purge Judah, Jerusalem, northern Israel, and Simeon. The eighteenth year is the year of the temple repairs, the finding of the book of the law and consequent events, a covenant renewal ceremony, and the Passover. This temporal marker is linked to "the purging of the land" (לטהר הארץ) that began in the twelfth year, showing that those events persisted through to the eighteenth year and that the forthcoming narrative is, in some respect, its continuation. Each temporal marker, eighth, twelfth, and eighteenth year, prepares the way for increasingly larger narrative units. Narrative time, therefore, slows with each successive marker. This pattern of

---

[40] There is no readily apparent reason given in the immediate narrative that explains why the Chr chose to commence the report of Josiah's reign in the eighth year. Even so, the Chr's decision may not be entirely arbitrary as the chronology for the reigns of Josiah (35:1) and Jehoahaz (36:2) reveal that Jehoahaz, Josiah's son, was born in this year. For another, rather novel and intriguing, reason, see W. Boyd Barrick, "Dynastic Politics, Priestly Succession, and Josiah's Eighth Year," *ZAW* 112, no. 4 (2000): 564-582, who argues that this is the year Hilkiah became High Priest.

slowing narrative time is reinforced by several markers that further define the eighteenth year and a general tendency in the narrative towards more exposition and less action.[41]

The temporal marker for the eighteenth year not only introduces the largest unit but also differs from the eighth and twelfth year markers in that there is a parallel temporal marker at the end of the narrated events of that year and there are specific and non-specific markers within the enclosed narrative that further divide the relative and absolute chronology of events.

The first two markers within the eighteenth year are non-specific and provide relative chronology. The first marker is a preposition, ב ("in, on, at"), and an accompanying event clause that situates the action of the main clause that follows it within a period of time roughly contemporaneous to the event described in the prepositional clause. This type of temporal clause occurs at the outset of 34:14; the Chr places the finding of the book of the law as an event occurring at the same time as the bringing out of the money brought to the temple. The common setting might suggest that the synchronicity implies causation, and indeed many readers would fail to make a distinction and so immediately assume causation, but this temporal clause makes no claims to causation. There is no definite causative relationship between the events of the temporal and main clauses. The real significance of this temporal clause, as such, is the decisive sidestep it initiates in the narrated world. Finished with the reform, repairs, and diachronic order that dominate 34:3-13, the Chr now moves the action synchronically to take up a new narrative thread located in the same time and place but concerned with a decidedly different topic.

The second marker is at the outset of 34:19. It is a temporal clause introduced by an apocopate waw prefix conjugation of "to happen" (היה) followed by the preposition כ ("as") and an infinitive construct. This clause situates the event of the main clause as derivative of, though also nearly contemporaneous with, the temporal referent. In contrast to the temporal clause in

---

[41] Reflecting this point, the noun to verb ratio, by and large, increases as the narrative progresses; refer to the table in section A.2.

34:14 then, this temporal clause implies some level of causation.[42] The phrase "and it happened as soon as he heard" (ויהי כשמע) with a subject (implicit or explicit) and an object occurs thirty-three times in the HB and in every case the event in the temporal clause in some respect precipitates the event in the main clause.[43] Significantly though, the synchronic rather than diachronic force of the construction expresses the immediacy of the event in the main clause to the event in the temporal clause; the events occur almost simultaneously.

The next temporal marker that relates to the structure of the Josiah narrative occurs in 35:1. In this case, the precise date formulation "on the fourteenth day of the first month" (בארבעה עשר לחדש הראשון) focuses narrative time on a particular day, in a particular month, and, in concert with 34:8//35:19, a particular year. It is on this day that Josiah keeps the Passover.

The sequence of events in the Passover is further defined by a non-specific temporal marker in 35:14. This verse begins with the particle "after" (אחר) and introduces a sub-unit, 35:14-15, of 35:10-16. This sub-unit relates how the Levites prepared the Passover for themselves, the Aaronite priests, the Asaphite singers, various functionaries, and the gatekeepers after preparations had been made for the community-at-large.

In 35:16 and 35:17, there are back-references to the specific marker in 35:1. The back-reference in 35:16 ("on that day" ביום ההוא), a specific temporal marker, refers to the temporal marker in v.1 to emphasize that the events in the Passover narrative proper occurred on the same day, that is the fourteenth day of the first month, the day of the Passover. The back-reference in 35:17 ("at that time" בעת ההיא), by contrast, is more general and non-specific. It

---

[42] Even so, the event in the temporal clause is not necessarily the sole or primary cause of the event in the main clause; it is only the immediate trigger of that event.

[43] See and cf. Gen 29:13, 39:15, 19; Deut 5:23; Josh 5:1, 6:20, 9:1, 10:1, 11:1; Judg 7:15; 1 Kgs 5:21, 12:2, 20, 13:4, 14:6, 15:21, 19:13, 20:12, 21:15, 16, 27; 2 Kgs 5:8, 6:30, 19:1, 22:11; Isa 37:1; Jer 36:16; Neh 1:4, 13:3; 1 Chr 14:15; 2 Chr 10:2, 16:5, 34:19.

functions as a transitional phrase from the Passover proper to the evaluation and refers not only to the day of the Passover celebration but also to subsequent days in which the community celebrated the Feast of Unleavened Bread. This general period of time is immediately circumscribed by a specific temporal marker that situates these events within a period of seven days (שבעת ימים). The Passover narrative and the whole narrative concerning Josiah's eighteenth year ends in 35:19 with a second eighteenth year marker, which forms the inclusio with the first such marker in 35:8.

The particle "after" (אחר) is then used again as a transitional word and non-specific temporal marker in 35:20. In this case, "after" (אחר) delineates a clear temporal space in the narrative that separates the events it introduces from those of the eighteenth year that precede it. Of course, at first glance, it is still conceivable that the events to follow could be occurring in the eighteenth year. Yet, the narrative concerns the death of Josiah and this, given the terms of reference in 34:1, sets these events in the thirty-first year of Josiah's reign, thirteen years after the Passover celebration. The Chr, however, likely chose not to state the year of Josiah's reign explicitly in order to create a sense of temporal contiguity, and also thematic and ideological interdependence, between the otherwise seemingly disconnected events.[44] Also, had the Chr begun this unit with a reference to the thirty-first year of Josiah's reign, this would instantly suggest an account that concerns the death of Josiah. By using a non-specific marker then, the Chr is able to suspend this revelation until it actually occurs in the narrated world and suggest, however veiled, an ideological relationship to the events that have gone before.[45]

---

[44] On this technique in Chronicles, see esp. Isaac Kalimi, "Literary-Chronological Proximity in the Chronicler's Historiography," *VT* 43, no. 3 (1993): 318-338.

[45] This ideological relationship will be discussed in the next two chapters.

2.5 Scenes and Sequences

Scenes and sequences are sub-divisions in a narrative usually brought about by changes in setting and character constellations, changes in action and dialogue (or monologue), or changes in topic. The demarcation of scenes and sequences is interrelated with the other structural markers already discussed; that is, those techniques are often indicative of scene changes. This section draws on those discussions but focuses primarily on the story elements of the scenes and sequences, not the structural markers, that promote cohesion and demarcate units, or sub-units, in the text.

In 34:3b-7, there is a travelogue that starts in the center (Jerusalem and Judah), moves to the periphery (northern Israel and Simeon), and returns to the center (Jerusalem). For the most part, Josiah is the subject of the entire unit, though there is a plural subject, who undertakes the first action, in 34:4. The report is primarily conveyed with verbs of destruction as the main topic of the unit is a purge of idolatry in Jerusalem, Judah, northern Israel, and Simeon. There is no dialogue in this unit.

The unit of 34:8-33 is undoubtedly the densest in terms of scene changes as its concentric structure reveals. Although narrative time slows as indicated by the arrangement of temporal markers over the whole Josiah narrative, the action speeds up in this unit, particularly in 34:14-28.[46] Setting figures prominently, especially, as already discussed, in the A-A' panels, which take place in the temple. The unit implicitly starts in the presence of the king in 34:8 and moves to the temple in 34:9. In 34:8-11, the Chr employs a series of transactions in order to move between characters. The Chr traces the distribution of the money and so introduces the high priest Hilkiah and the various groups of workers who are involved in the repairs on the

[46] Refer to section A.2. Although it was remarked earlier that there is a general tendency towards more exposition, the unit of 34:8-33, especially the first four scenes in vv.8-28, are characterized by a lower noun to verb ratio, which suggests more action. However, from vv.29 to 34:19, the noun to verb ratio rises dramatically.

temple as the money passes from one party to the next. The topic shifts slightly in 34:12-13, where the diligence and roles of the workers are explored rather than their payment for specific tasks highlighted.

In 34:14-18, the Chr foregrounds the transaction of the book of the law, a literary device similar to the money transaction in 34:8-11. The book passes in a chiastic arrangement from Hilkiah to Shaphan and Shaphan to Josiah. This also coincides with the first direct speech of the Josiah narrative: Hilkiah speaks to Shaphan and then Shaphan reports to Josiah. In 34:16, the setting moves from the temple and back to the place of the king. This case, however, is one of the few instances where the shift in setting does not coincide with a significant break in the unit, in large part because of the transaction of the book that unifies the unit. Still, it does create a soft break that divides the scene into two parts, Hilkiah and Shaphan (34:14-15) and Shaphan and Josiah (34:16-18), in a similar fashion to the two scene-parts of 34:8-11 and 34:12-13 in the previous unit (34:8-13).

In 34:19-21, the scene centers on the king's response to Shaphan's reading of the book of the law. The use of the conventional וַיְהִי ("and it happened") construction signals the scene change. As a part of a temporal clause, it situates the events as concurrent with Shaphan's reading of the book, which is mentioned at the end of the immediately preceding unit. The king is the subject throughout the scene. After tearing his clothes in a traditional act of mourning and repentance, he speaks for the first time in the narrative. He issues a command to members of his court that they go and consult with a prophet regarding the words of the book.

In 34:22, there is movement again as the setting shifts from the place of the king to Huldah's home in Jerusalem's Second Quarter and, in 34:28, back to the place of the king. These setting changes are again a type of travelogue that moves from center (the king's place) to periphery (Huldah's place) and back to center (the king's place); of course, there is a certain irony in that from the standpoint of character rather than setting constellations, it could be read as a move from periphery (the king) to center (Yahweh) and back to periphery (the king).

In 34:29-33, the king and all the people of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem go up from their places to the temple. The change in setting is clearly portrayed as periphery to center. In this scene, however, there is no explicit return to the place of origin (though there is a reference to Josiah's reforms in all Israel in 34:33); the temple remains the setting for the Passover in 35:1-19.

The Passover narrative (35:1-19) consists of four major units, 35:1-6, 35:7-9, 35:10-16, and 35:17-19, and the third unit is subdivided into two scene parts, 35:10-14 and 35:15-16. There are no significant setting changes in the narrative; the entire narrative takes place in the temple. The noticeable feature of the first unit is Josiah's speech to the Levites, which starts in 35:3. This is the second speech act attributed to the king. Josiah's speech to the Levites is characterized by a series of seven imperatives: "put" (תנו) ... "serve" (עבדו) .. "and make preparations" (והכונו) ... "and stand" (ועמדו) ... "and slaughter" (ושחטו) ... "and remain consecrated" (והתקדשו) ... "and make preparations" (והכינו). The conclusion of the speech is the conclusion of the unit.

The Chr then begins a new unit (35:7-9) that relates the provision of animals for the sacrifices by (1) the king (35:7), (2) his officials (35:8a), (3) Hilkiah, Zechariah, Jehiel, and the chiefs (נגיד) of the temple (35:8), and (4) Conaniah, Shemaiah, Nethanel, Hashabiah, Jeiel, Jozabad, and the chiefs (שר) of the Levites (35:9). This unit is unified by its common interest in these providers and their provisions. The king provides for the people; his officials provide for all; the priests for the priests; and the Levites for the Levites.

The next unit begins in 35:10, which acts as a conclusion to the preparations and contributions section by summarizing the accomplishments set out there while, at the same time, it acts as an introduction to the commencement of the Passover, which begins in 35:11. The Chr focuses the presentation of the Passover service on the procedures undertaken by the priests and Levites. The first part of the service describes the sacrifices and service for the people (35:10-13). The temporal marker in 35:14 introduces a new sub-unit that concerns the special

provisions that were made by the Levites on behalf of the priests and other functionaries in the service. The detail throughout the narrative, especially in the second sub-unit, is quite extraordinary. The Passover service is not simply narrated as a sequence of waw consecutive verbs but rather the Chr interjects significant commentary.[47] The Passover service comes to completion in 35:16 while 35:17-19 provides an evaluation of the whole event.

In 35:20-25, the setting motif of center-periphery-center again presents itself as Josiah travels out from Jerusalem (center) to meet Neco in battle at Megiddo (periphery) and then has to be brought back to Jerusalem (center). This section also consists of two speech acts; one by Neco and the other by Josiah.

2.6 Synthesis

The many different structural techniques in use in the Josiah narrative organize and order the narrative in a variety of different ways.[48] This structural analysis has revealed that the Josiah narrative consists of roughly twenty-seven distinguishable units.[49] Some of these units function as self-sufficient pericopes while others are merely scenes or scene-parts in such pericopes. Some of the units are a part of particular schematic arrangements that map the entire narrative. Other units are not part of these larger schematic arrangements and actually seem to defy those arrangements in that they sometimes draw together verses that within a particular schematic arrangement are separate. These units also do not necessarily fit neatly into any alternative, all-encompassing schema.

---

[47] Note the still relatively high noun-to-verb ratio (refer to section A.2).

[48] Refer to sections A.3 and A.4 for tables summarizing this data.

[49] 33:25b–36:1, 34:1–35:27, 34:1-2, 34:2-33, 34:3-13, 34:3a, 34:3b-7, 34:8 – 35:19, 34:8-33, 34:8-13, 34:8-11, 34:12-13, 34:14-18, 34:14-15, 34:16-18, 34:19-21, 34:22-28, 34:29-33, 35:1-19, 35:1-6, 35:7-9, 35:10-16, 35:10-14, 35:15-16, 35:17-19, 35:20-25, 35:26-27.

The tapestry of structural techniques in the Josiah narrative suggests that the Chr aims to communicate more than one message to the readership and, by virtue of this tapestry, the readership can adapt the text to many different discourses (see chapter 5). The units of 34:2b-33 and 35:20-25, e.g., are self-sufficient stories that have entertainment and didactic value and so especially suited to homiletical or popular discourse. Conversely, the Passover unit (35:1-19), amplified by the king's seven imperatives, is prescriptive in tone and especially suited to cultic and liturgical discourse. The adaptability of the narrative parts, however, does not deny the overall cohesiveness of the text. On the contrary, it can strengthen it. The unit of 34:8–35:19, e.g., combines parts of 34:2b-33 and all of 35:1-19 as events of Josiah's eighteenth year. While the unit of 34:2b-33 may be used to stress covenant renewal and loyalty in a didactic setting and the unit of 35:1-19 might function on its own in a cultic and liturgical discourse on the proper performance of the Passover, the unit of 34:8–35:19 de-emphasizes these messages because of its different starting point and instead, for a general post-exilic readership, might draw attention to temple and community life shaped by the book of the law and the experience of exile. In turn, these units are not only an interrelated narrative on Josiah but function together as a part of the whole of the Chr's work.

Moreover, there are some consistent and pervasive rhetorical aims that emerge through the analysis of the tapestry. It is, of course, self-evident that the narrative focus of the Josiah narrative are the events of the eighteenth year; it contains, by far, the most detailed and sophisticated units. More than this, however, the concentric structure emphasizes Josiah's mourning and repentance as a central, climactic event while the chronological and temporal markers clearly come together to emphasize the Passover day as a central, climactic event. Additionally, the structural techniques, especially the movement in the scenes and sequences, reinforces the centrality of Jerusalem and the temple in the narrative world. Structure already gives an indication of ideology.

Aside from this, and most important, the tapestry of structures enables and encourages reading and re-reading. At the same time the Chr schematizes Josiah's reign almost to the point of banality, there are subversive elements that defy this schematization: purges are completed and then broadened, a book is found and juxtaposed with a prophecy, people move from center to periphery to center or periphery to center to periphery. For all the structural focus on the eighteenth year too, it is summarily dismissed by the Chr with a simple "After all this..."; the king's mourning and repentance and the Passover are immediately consigned to an irrecoverable, and one almost suspects soon-to-be irrelevant, past in the narrated world. The structures undermine one another so that the text can play at multiple ideological discourses. Of course, it all begins to depend on the content; the content develops the interconnections with the wider narrative and brings the aims of the narrative world into focus (and then, the readers too have to receive the content). Put another way, the structure is the how but the interpreter still needs answers to the what (content) and the why (audience).

Chapter 3

Of Reforms and Festivals: The Reign of Josiah

Studying the Chr's literary technique in the Josiah narrative naturally points to the ideological impulses that are at work in the narrative by revealing how the content is organized and delivered to emphasize and draw attention to certain elements of the narrative and away from others. Still, the study of structure and form undertaken in the previous chapter does not entirely address the nature of the content itself. The goal, therefore, in the next two chapters is an analysis of the content and its function within the world of Chronicles in general and within the world of the Josiah narrative in particular. This chapter will focus on the account of the reign of Josiah, which consists primarily of reforms and festivals.

3.1 The Restorer of Order

The positive evaluation of Josiah in 2 Chr 34:2 and 35:26-27 aligns Josiah with the good kings of the Davidic monarchy: David, Solomon, Abijah, Asa, Uzziah, and Hezekiah.[50] In contrast to these other good kings in Chronicles though, Josiah is not primarily a builder or a warrior. Instead, Josiah belongs to an ANE character type that Liverani identifies as "the restorer of order" or, more appropriately for the Chr, "the consummator of order."[51]

---

[50] There is no formal theological evaluation of Abijah but the account of his reign is uniformly positive and therefore I have included him in this list. There is also a subset of good kings who receive a more tempered theological evaluation by the Chr, i.e. Jehoshaphat (see 2 Chr 17:3-4), Joash (see 2 Chr 24:2), and Amaziah (see 2 Chr 25:2).

[51] Mario Liverani, "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts," *Or* 42, no. 1-2 (1973): 186. Liverani does not specifically identify Josiah of Chronicles as a character of this type but, as I will argue, this pattern does apply.

In "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts," Liverani identifies several common ideological motifs and character types that permeate historiographical texts.[52] Paramount to understanding some of these motifs is "the characterization of time as cyclic" in which events are perceived as positive or negative and in which "all positive events" are temporally located in one period and "all negative events" are temporally located in another period.[53] From this characterization of time, a pattern emerges in numerous historiographical texts in which time moves in a cycle from good to bad to good. Making reference to "the reforms of Urukagina, the edict of Telipinu, ... [and the edict] of Horemhab" as examples, Liverani situates the restorer of order at a specific point in this cycle:

> The happy past is pushed back into a more remote past, a veritable mythical age, and its function of ideal model of a corrected situation is underscored. The phase of corruption and chaos is over, i.e. moved from the present to a nearby past, just finished; while the second stage of order and prosperity is moved ahead from the future to the present ... [or] the immediate future.[54]

The restorer of order is the subject or catalyst that promises the order of an immediate future and goes on to inaugurate that order.

In large part, this is the situation in the Josiah narrative. The reign of Amon (33:21-24) with its "corruption and chaos is over" and a new king is made ruler by the people of the land (33:25). The intervention of the people of the land immediately suggests a reversal—a new beginning rather than a succession—and so signals the soon-to-be-present "second stage of order and prosperity," a return to the model past of Moses, David, and Solomon. Indeed, the opening regnal resume (34:1-2) confirms the beginning of a good cycle. The program for reform is inaugurated when Josiah begins to seek the god of his father David in the eighth year (34:3) and continues with the many narrated events that proceed from this. Especially in the Passover

---

[52] Liverani, "Memorandum," 178-194.
[53] Liverani, "Memorandum," 187.
[54] Liverani, "Memorandum," 187-188.

narrative, the Chr repeatedly invokes the cultic authority of Moses, David, and Solomon, which emphasizes this pattern of return and restoration.

Liverani's analysis, however, does not entirely explain the situation in Chronicles or the character of Josiah.[55] In Chronicles, time is generally not cyclic; it is rhythmic.[56] Also, order exists independently of any king, as a sort of "eternal Torah" to which the righteous are always subject and which the righteous strive to see fully realized.[57] The *Urzeit*, therefore, is never completely idealized; instead, it is instrumentalized for use by subsequent generations.[58] Also, Josiah is not simply a restorer of order who attempts to see torah fully realized through the purge, the repairs, the covenant, and the Passover. His programme, aided by the finding of the book of the law, is presented by the Chr as another step towards an eschatological realization of order that builds on and constantly transforms, rather than simply restores, the successes of the *Urzeit*; a process the Chr invites the readers to join, by way of Cyrus's edict in 2 Chr 36:22-23, in their present age.

---

[55] Of course, to be fair, this is not his intent.

[56] I follow the recent work of Sacha Stern, *Time and Process in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2003), who argues that time in the HB and ancient Judaism is process-related. Calendars and chronology do not measure a transcendent time dimension, as in the classical world, but rather coordinate processes. Thus, it is the predictable rhythm of these processes that serves to measure and coordinate definite points in time. Moreover, these processes are inherently teleological because the world is governed by an active god, who purposes events. See and cf. Ehud Ben Zvi, "About Time: Observations about the Construction of Time in the Book of Chronicles," *HBT* 22 (2000): 17-31; Marc Zvi Brettler, "Cyclical and Teleological Time in the Hebrew Bible" in *Time and Temporality in the Ancient World* (ed. Ralph M. Rosen; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2004), 111-128; Arnaldo Momigliano, "Time in Ancient Historiography" in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1977), 179-204.

[57] The concept of "eternal Torah" is actually a later post-biblical development but the trajectory towards such a concept can already be seen in the Chr's view of torah and the nature of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. The Chr's view of torah is both transcendent and immanent; transcendent insofar as it is rooted in Yahweh's transcendence and immanent insofar as it has been revealed to Israel in time and since that time is always present in the life of Israel. This transcendence and immanence inspires the inchoate sense of "eternal Torah" in Chronicles.

[58] For this distinction, I am indebted to Jonker, *Reflections*, 33, who makes it with respect to the Chr's presentation of Josiah.

3.2 The Purge

In Chronicles, the purge of idolatry is a subset of the literary motif of formation and reformation that flows throughout the entire book. This motif recurs in the accounts of several kings and serves to advance the reputation of that king as pious and faithful at the same time that it functions to reveal developments in the cult. Kings, or the people of the land under them, who act with piety and faithfulness will repair the temple, build up, advance, or reform the temple service, defeat enemies, secure (or expand) the land of Israel and Judah, engage in building activities, promote justice, or purge idolatry. Despite the common motif, the Chr still draws distinct portraits of each king and so these actions, if the king is pious and faithful at some point, occur in a variety of combinations and are carried out by the king or the people (or both) with varying degrees of scope, zeal, and success in each account.[59] Purges are mentioned in the accounts of the reigns of Asa (14:2, 4, 15:8, 16; cf. 15:17), Jehoshaphat (17:6, 19:3; cf. 20:33), Jehoiada and Joash (23:17; cf. 24:17-18), Hezekiah (29:5; 30:14, 31:1), Manasseh (33:15; cf. 33:17), and Josiah (34:3b-7, 34:33a). Only the purges in the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah are not undermined by a subsequent qualification or limitation on their thoroughness.

Josiah's purge essentially completes and perfects the process of eradication undertaken by the previous kings; it is more thorough and extends farther than the previous purges.[60] It

---

[59] Japhet, *Ideology*, 489, 491, observes, "When we read about these kings in Chronicles, we are immediately struck by the great variety and complexity to be found in their histories – the personalities, accomplishments, and appraisals of Judah's monarchs are far from uniform ... We see the Chronicler presents multi-faceted portrayals of Judah's monarchs, avoiding simplistic or all-embracing judgments."

[60] In terms of scope, the catalogue of Jehoshaphat's purge is the most limited, only the "high places" (במות) and the "asherim" (אשרים) are mentioned (17:6). Reference to this purge is made a second time in a speech by the prophet Jehu, who mentions only the "asherim" (19:3), and there is a subsequent qualification in 20:33 that undermines the success of this purge by reporting that the "high places" were not removed.

The purge by "all the people" in the reign of Jehoiada and Joash and Manasseh's purge are also relatively limited in that they concern the reversal of an immediately preceding situation and are limited geographically to Jerusalem and the temple. The purge undertaken by "all the people" is an *ad hoc* programme that reverses Athaliah's idolatry while the purge by Manasseh reverses his own acts of idolatry. The catalogues are, therefore, distinctive and comparatively unique.

begins in Judah and Jerusalem with the corporate destruction of the altars of the Baals and Josiah's destruction of the "incense altars" (חמנים) above them, Josiah's obliteration of "the asherim and the graven images and the molten images" (האשרים והפסלים והמסכות) into ashes, the desecration of heathen graves with those ashes, and the burning of the bones of their priests (34:3b-5).

With Judah and Jerusalem purified, Josiah expands the purge into the former Samarian territories of Manasseh and Ephraim, expands it further to envelop the southernmost and northernmost territories of Simeon and Naphtali (שמעון ועד־נפתלי), and finally moves "throughout the hill country, their houses all around" (34:6-7).[61] In these peripheries, Josiah destroys the altars, asherim, graven images, and incense altars. The Chr reports that the purge covered "all the land of Israel" (כל־ארץ ישראל in 34:7) and removed "all the abominations from all the lands which belonged to Israel" (כל־התועבות מכל־הארצות אשר לבני ישראל in 34:33). The Chr, therefore, presents Josiah's purge as comprehensive, not only including the old kingdom of Samaria but all the territories of Israel as adumbrated in the geographical distribution of the tribes in the genealogies of 1 Chr 1–9.[62]

The most extensive purges are carried out by Asa, "the great assembly" and "all Israel" in the reign of Hezekiah, and Josiah. All these purges are reported as systematic and comprehensive programmes and, to varying degrees, all three purges extend to territory in northern Israel. The purges also involve the destruction of common objects: "the asherim" (האשרים), "the high places" (הבמות), "the altars" (המזבחות) are mentioned in all three reports and "the incense altars" (החמנים) are mentioned in the Asa and Josiah purges. In 30:14, the Chr reports in the reign of Hezekiah that המקטרות, also "the incense altars," were removed and so this provides an essentially equivalent counterpart to "the incense altars" (החמנים) mentioned in the Asa and Josiah purges. Only Josiah's purge, however, extends beyond Manasseh and Ephraim to encompass all the territories of the Israelite tribes.

[61] The Chr twice names Simeon in a list with northern tribes: 2 Chr 15:9, 34:6. It is possible that the Chr, therefore, follows a tradition of the presence of Simeon in the north; there is, however, no evidence that the Chr is aware of such a tradition beyond these two lists, which do not explicitly claim that Simeon is a northern tribe. More likely, the Chr does not include Simeon among the northern tribes, uses Manasseh and Ephraim to represent the eight tribes that comprise northern Israel, understands the southern kingdom as Benjamin, Judah, and Levi only, and consequently considers Simeon, in the period of divided Israel, a separate yet historically Israelite southern society. Simeon, displaced rather than integrated into Judah, chooses to migrate westward to Philistine coastal cities (1 Chr 4:39-41) and southward towards Seir (1 Chr 4:42-43).

[62] On the geographical distribution of the tribes in the genealogies, see Yigal Levin, "Understanding Biblical Genealogies," *CurBS* 9 (2001): 11-46.

The comprehensiveness of the purge as described by the Chr is often overlooked by scholars who read Chronicles in the light of Kings. In these cases, scholars are quick to note that the Chr has abbreviated the considerably more substantial and detailed account of Josiah's purge that is presented in 2 Kgs 23:1-7. This becomes a device to downplay the significance of the purge in Chronicles. However, when taken in the world of Chronicles, it is clear that Josiah's purge represents the complete eradication of idolatry at that time; it builds on Hezekiah's success and marks a decisive step towards the complete realization of a wholly centralized cult centered in the Jerusalem temple. Moreover, in contrast to Kings, the purge in Chronicles does not take place only in the eighteenth year. Instead, the purge commences in the twelfth year, continues into the eighteenth year alongside the temple repairs (34:8), and only concludes with the covenant renewal ceremony in the eighteenth year (34:33).

3.3 The Repairs

Temple repairs are another type of reform and so, in part, can be regarded as an extension of the purge of idolatry. The transition from the purge to the temple repairs in Josiah's reign makes exactly this point (34:8). Furthermore, every king who undertakes repairs of the temple also conducts a purge of idolatry and the former almost always occurs within close, if not concurrent, literary and/or chronological proximity to the latter. Repairs to the temple are undertaken by Asa (15:8b), Joash (24:4-16), Hezekiah (29:3-19), Manasseh (33:15-16), and Josiah (34:8-13, 16-17). Hezekiah's and Manasseh's purges (29:5 and 33:15) and their repairs to the temple are concurrent and could even be regarded as part of the same action.

The report of Josiah's repairs draws together similar elements present in the repairs undertaken by Joash and Hezekiah. Like the report of Joash's repairs, this report pays significant attention to the financial issues involved in the repair and, like the report of Hezekiah's repairs, the organization of the Levites receives considerable attention. The Chr's report of Josiah's

repairs, however, is not as thorough in its dramatization of either of these topics or, at least, the Chr explores these topics with a slightly different emphasis. This is likely because the Chr presupposes the material from the previous reports and, in this case, draws attention to previously un-mentioned aspects of the repair process.

The account of the repairs starts with the king's commission, given to three of his officials, to repair the temple. The Chr reports that the king's officials brought to Hilkiah, the High Priest, the money that the Levites collected "from Manasseh and Ephraim, from all the rest [שאריתּ] of Israel, from all Judah and Benjamin, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" (34:9). Japhet remarks that this report presents the successful collection that the Levites botched in Joash's reign (24:5-6); that is, the Levites, in this case, diligently travel throughout all Israel to collect the money for the temple.[63] This, in turn, strongly suggests that the Chr's communicative intent in the earlier narrative was not to normalize the measures taken by Joash. The itinerary of the Levites, like the geographical presentation of Josiah's purge, also highlights the reintegration of northern Israel into the religious sphere of the Jerusalem cult (as already occurs in Hezekiah's reign after the exile of northern Israel), points to the pervasiveness of Josiah's religio-cultic influence, and reminisces the period of the united kingdom of David and Solomon. Even so, it is a very post-exilic itinerary. The use of the phrase שאריתּ ישׂראל "rest [remnant] of Israel" is an ideologically nuanced choice that almost certainly and deliberately calls attention to a destroyed northern polity and a greatly reduced population. In this respect, this is not David and Solomon's Israel but rather an Israel whose northern part has experienced a cataclysm.

The money, and its disbursement, serves as a key device to move forward the exposition to the organization of the laborers, their assigned tasks, and the levitical oversight in the temple project. After the king's officials bring the money to Hilkiah, the Levites distribute it to "the

---

[63] Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 1026.

master of the work" (עשה המלאבה) for the temple project and from "the master of the work" the money is disbursed to "the construction workers" (עשי המלאבה; 34:10), that is "to the craftsmen and to the builders" (לחרשים ולבנים) so that they can "buy hewn stones and timber for beams and to buttress the buildings" (34:11).

After delaying a reason for the temple repairs, the Chr appends in 34:11 the criticism "[the buildings] which the kings of Judah destroyed" (אשר השחיתו מלכי יהודה).[64] Many translators and commentators lessen the force of the Chr's criticism by translating "destroyed" (השחיתו) as "allowed to decay."[65] This is simply not tenable, especially given that it appears in the *hip'il* (and not the *nip'al*) and thus clearly refers to a deliberate act of destruction.[66] The language functions positively to present Josiah as a temple builder and a second Solomon. It is also consistent with the Chr's tendency to portray dramatic shifts in the religio-cultic fortunes of monarchic Judah.[67] Conversely, the language also pre-figures the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Chr 36:19), which adds to the spectre of exile, already introduced by the phrase "the rest of Israel" (שארית ישראל) earlier in this account (34:9), and that lies as a pall over the entire Josiah narrative—a point to which I return in the next chapter.

In the remaining verses on the temple repairs, the Chr commends the workers on their diligence and explicates the supervisory roles of the Levites (34:12-13). In contrast to the Hezekiah repairs (29:3-17), only two of the seven levitical houses are identified in this narrative, namely Kohath and Merari. Even so, the narrative does discuss the levitical oversight over the

---

[64] In the world of Chronicles, the kings implied can only be Manasseh and Amon. Still, the Chr does not make this explicit (in contrast to the KH) and thus seems to cast dispersion on the entire Judean dynasty.

[65] See, e.g., NAB, NASB, NIV, NJB, NJPS, NLT, NRSV, RSV, and cf. ASV, KJV, and NKJV. For commentators, see e.g. Myers, *II Chronicles*, 202, 207; Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbücher* (HAT 21; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955), 322 and cf. Japhet, *Chronicles*, 1017, 1028.

[66] On the *hip'il*, see esp. Bruce Waltke and Michael O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 433-446.

[67] Other major examples of such a shift include the division of the kingdoms (2 Chr 10), the transition from the reign Ahaz to Hezekiah with the re-opening of the temple in the first month (2 Chr 28–29), and Manasseh's repentance in Babylon and its dramatic repercussions for the cult (2 Chr 33:1-20).

workers, their skill in musical instruments (likely a reference to the use of music in and the ritualization of ANE building projects), and their roles as secretaries, book-keepers, and gatekeepers. Then, as noted in the last chapter, the Chr transitions in 34:14 from the temple repairs to the finding of the book of the law through a back-reference to the money brought in by the king's officials at the start of this report.

3.4 The Book of the Law and Huldah's Prophecy

The finding of "the book of law of Yahweh [written] by the hand of Moses" is a defining moment of Josiah's reign (2 Chr 34:14-15). It is also a unique event that distinguishes Josiah's reign from that of his predecessors and successors, so much so that the Chr's theological assessment of Josiah (2 Chr 34:2) seems inspired by this event. In stating that Josiah did not "deviate to the left or the right" (לא סר ימין ושמאול), the assessment reflects a common idiom in the HB used especially of those who follow the commandments of Yahweh. In this context and in connection with the finding of the book of the law, it evokes Deut 17:18-20:

> Once seated on his royal throne, and for his own use, he [the king] must write a copy of this Law on a scroll, at the dictation of the levitical priests. It must never leave him, and he must read it every day of his life and learn to fear Yahweh his God by keeping all the words of this Law and observing these rules, so that he will not think himself superior to his brothers, and not deviate [לבלתי סור] from these commandments either to right [ימין] or to left [ושמאול]. So doing, long will he occupy his throne, he and his sons, in Israel. (NJB)

Still, the law of Yahweh and even the book of the law are known to the kings of Judah before Hilkiah discovers it in the temple in Josiah's reign.

The Chr makes repeated reference to "law" or "torah" (תורה) throughout the reigns of nearly all the kings of Israel and Judah. It is variously referred to as "Yahweh's law" (1 Chr 16:40; 2 Chr 12:1, 17:9, 31:3, 4, 35:26), "the law of Yahweh your god" (1 Chr 22:12), "my [Yahweh's] law" (2 Chr 6:16), "the law" (2 Chr 14:3, 15:3, [19:10], 31:21, 34:15, 19), "Moses's law" (2 Chr 23:18, 30:16), "the law in the book of Moses" (2 Chr 25:4), and "Yahweh's law by

the hand of Moses" (2 Chr 33:8, 34:14).[68] In eight cases, the law is presented as a written document, either through the Chr's use of the verb כתב "to write" (1 Chr 16:40; 2 Chr 23:18, 31:3, 35:26), the noun ספר "book" (2 Chr 17:9, 34:14, 15), or both (2 Chr 25:4).[69] In six of these cases, the Chr uses the reference to the written torah to authorize and/or legitimate an action or set of actions (1 Chr 16:40; 2 Chr 23:18, 25:4, 31:3, 35:26). In the remaining two cases in 2 Chr 17:9 and in the Josiah narrative (2 Chr 34:14-15), the written torah is actually a functional story element in the narrative. In 2 Chr 17:9, the teaching Levites take the book of the law with them as they travel through the cities of Judah while in the Josiah narrative, its re-discovery by the high priest (34:14-15) leads the king to tear his clothes as an act of mourning and contrition and subsequently seek Yahweh's counsel through a prophet (34:19-21).

As a literary motif, while unique in Chronicles, book-finding is quite common in ANE literature and propaganda.[70] It is a device that legitimates or authorizes an action or set of actions in the same way torah, whether presented as written or not, functions throughout Chronicles. Torah or the found book provides historical and religious precedent. The problem is that this purpose for the book-finding motif does not quite fit its function in Chronicles precisely because torah already plays this role. The idea that Judean kings are ignorant of torah is simply not a possibility in the world of Chronicles. Kings either obey torah or defy it; they are never ignorant of its demands. As such, from a literary standpoint, the finding of the book of law,

---

[68] The use of "torah" (תורה) in 19:10 may not refer to the law in the same sense as it is otherwise used throughout Chronicles. There are also more generic references to law in terms such as "commandment" (מצוה), "statute" ([ח]קים), and "judgment" ([מ]שפטים).

[69] By contrast, in Samuel-Kings, the law is identified as a written document by the use of "to write" (כתב) in 2 Kings 2:3, and 14:6 (par. 2 Chr 25:4), the noun "book" (ספר) in 2 Kings 17:37 and 22:8, 11 (par. 2 Chr 34:14, 15), and both in 2 Kings 23:24. A written "torah" (תורה) is not mentioned, as in Chronicles, in the reigns of Jehoshaphat or Manasseh.

[70] See esp. Thomas C. Römer, "Transformations in Deuteronomistic Biblical Historiography: On 'Book-Finding' and other Literary Strategies," *ZAW* 109, no. 1 (1997): 1-11; Wolfgang Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike: Mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970).

though it informs Josiah's actions (see 34:30-31, 35:6, 12), can not really be seen as providing historical or religious precedent for Josiah's actions; this precedent already existed.[71]

Instead, the finding of the book of law functions as a prophetic word to the king, which warns or informs of judgment, and, in turn, suggests that, in some respect, Josiah's actions up to this point are not entirely satisfactory. This may account for Shaphan's delay in presenting it to the king; Shaphan, instead, opts to tell Josiah first that the king's orders have been carried out and only then makes reference to the book (34:16-18). Certainly, the king's despondent reaction as he tears his clothes reveals that the book of the law condemns Israel and apparently also its king.[72] From Josiah's standpoint, as articulated in his speech in 34:21, the wrath of Yahweh confronts Israel and Judah as a result of the sins of their fathers and, on this count, Josiah immediately orders a delegation to seek out Yahweh through a prophet (34:19-21).

The prophet's oracle confirms the message of woe in the book.[73] Huldah's prophecy, however, contradicts the king's interpretation of the situation to a certain extent. Yahweh's words through Huldah place blame upon the people and do not mention their fathers. The people, Yahweh claims, have forsaken their god and made offerings to other gods (34:25); only Josiah has been faithful and therefore only he can be spared from the curses of the book. Accordingly, Glatt-Gilad appropriately observes that while "Josiah's personal righteousness is praiseworthy ... his reforms to this point have not altered the fundamental religious estrangement of the people at large."[74] Huldah's prophecy, therefore, represents a turning point in the narrative in which the emphasis shifts from "an exclusive focus on Josiah's personal execution of the reforms to a

---

[71] This is not to say that if the story has some historical basis that the finding of the book of law did not actually function this way; it is only to say that it does not function this way in the narrative.

[72] And which the reader can imagine comes as some relief to Shaphan.

[73] Lowell K. Handy, "The Role of Huldah in Josiah's Cult Reform," *ZAW* 106, no. 1 (1994): 52, observes that this is a case of "double-check on the will of the deity," an ANE literary motif.

[74] David A. Glatt-Gilad, "The Role of Huldah's Prophecy in the Chronicler's Portrayal of Josiah's Reform," *Bib* 77, no. 1 (1996): 23.

greater concern for the popular allegiance" reflected in the covenant renewal (esp. 34:33) and the Passover (esp. 34:17).[75]

Unfortunately for the people, Huldah's prophecy gives no explicit indication that the judgment against them could be averted.[76] Nevertheless, in the world of Chronicles, there is certainly the possibility that Yahweh might change his judgments. This is evident in 2 Chr 12:5-8 (N.B. the initial oracle in v.5, like Huldah's prophecy, is not conditional), 29:5-11, 30:6-9, and 33:11-13. Particularly relevant to this narrative is the way in which it aligns with Hezekiah's speech in 2 Chr 29:5-11. Hezekiah sought to renew the covenant to avert Yahweh's judgment; a measure that clearly meets with success. Taken together with Josiah's own acts of contrition that spare him, there is an implicit, yet also clear, means for the people to stay the judgment against them. Consequently, Josiah gathers the people to the temple (34:29-30), reads to them the book as it was read to him (34:30), and seeks to renew the covenant between the people and their god (34:31-32).[77]

3.5 The Covenant

The concept of covenant is a critical one in Chronicles. Contrary to Japhet's analysis of this theme in Chronicles, covenant must be seen as one of the critical ways through which the Chr defines the relationship between Yahweh and Israel.[78] While Japhet, I think, correctly observes that the nature of the relationship between Yahweh and the people is presented in

---

[75] Glatt-Gilad, "Huldah's Prophecy," 30.

[76] The oracle appears to rule out any possibility of a change in the judgment given Yahweh's declaration in 34:25 that his wrath will not be quenched (חמתי ... לא תכבה). However, "it will not be quenched" (לא תכבה) should be understood as a reference to the judgment underway rather than as a surety that the judgment will take place.

[77] Of course, the readership an re-readership knows that the judgment is not stayed and this, therefore, casts Josiah's actions as all the more noble and pious. Faced by the certainty of judgment, Josiah remains faithful.

[78] Japhet, *Ideology*, 116, writes, "The book of Chronicles goes one step further: 'covenant' – whether the result of a past event or an ongoing condition – no longer describes the relationship between God and Israel."

Chronicles as timeless, it is still the concept of covenant that circumscribes that timeless relationship.[79]

The Chr presents a covenant with Yahweh as an inviolable contract that cannot cease to exist even when the human party is derelict in their part. This is stated explicity of the Davidic covenant in 2 Chr 13:5 (cf. Lev 2:13) and 21:7 and it is my sense that this also holds true for the covenant between Yahweh and Israel as presented in Chronicles even though it is not explicitly stated. In particular, the threat of punishment from Yahweh for a human party's apostasy should not be seen as the end of the covenant but rather as its enforcement according to the terms. To be sure, Yahweh is free to re-define the terms of a covenant but a covenant with Yahweh essentially remains indissoluble.

In this respect, the Chr's perspective on the covenant between Yahweh and Israel seems to depend in no small part on Lev 26 (or similarly Deut 28), which provides for blessings of produce, peace, victory against enemies, fertility, and restoration after exile if the people are faithful (vv.1-13) and curses of plague and sickness, famine, defeat, exile, desolation and sabbath rest for the land if the people are unfaithful (vv.14-39). All of these blessings and curses factor as an important component of the theme of immediate reward and punishment that flows throughout Chronicles.[80] Importantly though, while the warnings and disasters are extensive, Lev

---

[79] Japhet, *Ideology*, 116-124, argues that the Chr denies that any historical processes explain the relationship between Yahweh and Israel and that the relationship exists *a priori* from creation on. In this, Japhet appears to me to force her interpretation, concentrating too much on later post-biblical developments to this effect. The genealogies, as Gary N. Knoppers, "Intermarriage, Social Complexity, and Ethnic Diversity in the Genealogy of Judah," *JBL* 120, no. 1 (2001): 15-30, argues, suggest that the Chr sees Israel's emergence and hence Yahweh's relationship with it only when its eponyms, Eber and Israel, are mentioned. Furthermore, the Chr does preserve several vestiges of the Sinai experience and it seems to me situates the covenant in that formative time; see esp. Simon J. De Vries, "Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles," *JBL* 107, no. 4 (1988): 619-639. Nevertheless, Japhet is still correct insofar as the Chr presents these formative events as the inevitable consequence of history's teleology. The covenant and consequently Yahweh's relationship with Israel is predestined at creation and so timeless. This is reinforced by the opening chapter of the genealogies which weaves from Adam to Israel in a very deterministic and focused way and then suddenly opens up to the extensive genealogies of the sons of Israel, which are the tribes of Israel.

[80] The theme of immediate reward and punishment (or "immediate retribution") is an undeniable component of the Chr's narrative, see e.g. Raymond B. Dillard, "The Reign of Asa (2 Chronicles 14-16): An Example of the Chronicler's

26 ends with a promise from Yahweh that even when the people are in exile, "I shall not so utterly reject or detest them so as to destroy them completely and break my covenant with them; for I am Yahweh their God" (v.44 NJB). The covenant is inviolable because Yahweh's very identity as "their God" (אל היהם) depends upon it; a view the Chr seems to share especially in light of the book's rather optimistic conclusion (36:22-23).

Because the covenant between Yahweh and Israel endures, the Chr only ever identifies the necessity of Israel to renew their obligations under it and oath to it. Consequently, covenant renewal ceremonies in Chronicles are covenants or oaths to Yahweh or before Yahweh by the people and/or their leaders to uphold and obey terms in the pre-existent covenant.[81] Yahweh is never explicitly presented as a party to these covenant renewals because he is not in violation of its terms and so his continued participation does not need to be reaffirmed; it is only the people and their leaders who can be estranged and so who are required to reaffirm their adherence to the obligations of the covenant.

There are four explicit references to covenant renewal in Chronicles – in the reigns of Asa (2 Chr 15:12-15), Joash (2 Chr 23:16), Hezekiah (2 Chr 29:10), and Josiah (2 Chr 34:29-33). The covenant renewal ceremony in Josiah's reign begins with a summons of all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem (34:29), the king and all the people gathering to the temple (34:30), and a public reading of the "book of the covenant" (ספר הברית in v.30).

One of the initial problems of this text is that it is difficult to determine the exact composition of the people at this covenant renewal ceremony. The summons in v.29, as already

---

Theological Method," *JETS* 23 (1980): 207-218; "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retribution," *WTJ* 46, no. 1 (1984): 164-172; Japhet, *Ideology*, 150-198; Steven L. McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles* (AOTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004), passim. However, the theme has generally been overstressed by its proponents. The Chr also presents a world of inexplicable events, see Ehud Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion: An Aspect of the Theology of the Chronicler," *SJOT* 9, no. 1 (1995): 37-51.

[81] There are also covenants in Chronicles between only human parties, which do not renew the Sinaitic or Davidic covenant, even though they may help indirectly to preserve the latter (2 Chr 16:2-4, 23:1-3).

noted, is extended to all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem but, in v.30, the catalogue "all men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem and the priests and the Levites and all the people from the greatest to the least" seems to enlarge the group significantly. In v.32a, it is "all those present in Jerusalem and Benjamin," which employs a curious and unique collocation, who are made to stand.[82] Then, it is "all those present in Jerusalem" in v.32b who take action to keep the covenant with Yahweh. Finally, in v.33, it is "all those present in Israel" who are made to serve Yahweh. The great variance in the composition of the people may simply reflect stylization and, in this case, it seems likely that the Chr envisions "all Israel" as present, though it is curious that the Chr does not employ this staple phrase otherwise used so frequently throughout Chronicles.

After the reading of the book, the king covenants before Yahweh "to walk after Yahweh and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his laws with all his heart and with all his soul, to do the words of the covenant written on this book" (v.31). The reading of the book and the language of Josiah's covenant, particularly the phrase "with all his heart and with all his soul" and the pledge to keep "the words of the covenant written on this book," identify this ceremony as a renewal of the Sinaitic covenant.

Though it is initiated by the king, the people are enjoined to participate in it. To report this, the Chr employs the waw consecutive hiphil of עמד "to stand" in 34:32 with Josiah as the subject and the people as object but without any indirect object or prepositional phrase, which has caused some confusion among interpreters and translators. The context suggests that the phrase is apocopated: Josiah is not simply causing the people to stand up but rather that he is causing them to participate in some respect in the covenant that he has just made before

---

[82] The unusual collocation may reflect two Chronistic propositions. First, that Jerusalem is located in Benjamin (see 1 Chr 8:28, 32; cf. 1 Chr 9:3, 38; 2 Chr 34:32; Josh 18:28) even as it has a certain extra-territorial status and, second, that so many people were present at the ceremony that Jerusalem alone could not contain the numbers. Hence the people that are in attendance overflow to the surrounding environs of Jerusalem, i.e. the territory of Benjamin; those present are, quite literally from the Chr's perspective, in Jerusalem and in Benjamin.

Yahweh.[83] Many translators, therefore, add an indirect object or prepositional phrase in an attempt to clarify to what end Josiah causes the people to stand.[84]

The hiphil use of עמד "to stand" is actually quite common in cultic settings, as apparent from its many uses in Leviticus and Numbers. In these passages, people and/or sacrifices are presented or set before Yahweh or the priests either to be offered as sacrifices, appointed to a certain task, or alternatively judged (e.g. Lev 14:11, 16:7, 27:8, 11; Num 5:16, 18, 30, 8:13, 27-19, 22). In other contexts, the hiphil of עמד "to stand" often carries a sense of mustering or causing to participate (e.g. Num 3:6, 11:24). It seems likely that these senses are in view here and therefore that translators are justified in clarifying the phrase with an indirect object or prepositional phrase. The Chr envisions that Josiah offers the people to Yahweh, pledges them to participate in the convenant, and musters them to perform its obligations. This is confirmed in the actions taken in v.32b and v.33a, which solemnize the covenant: those present in Jerusalem perform (עשה) according to the covenant and the king completes the purge and mandates Yahwistic worship throughout all Israel.

The covenant renewal ceremony concludes with the statement that the people did not deviate from following Yahweh, God of their fathers, in all the remaining days of Josiah's reign. This note, as we have already seen in the last chapter, looks back to v.2 and shows that Josiah's programme of reform is now appropriated and accepted by the people.

In Chronicles, the king and/or people successively covenant (1) in Asa's reign, to seek Yahweh with all their heart and all their soul,[85] (2) in Joash's reign, to remain Yahweh's people,[86]

---

[83] Martin R. Hauge, "On the Sacred Spot: The Concept of the Proper Localization Before God," *SJOT* 1 (1990): 40-41, argues that the absence of any supplementary information is meant to juxtapose the people's position with the king's position, as described in 34:31 also with the verb "to stand" (עמד), which communicates a "heirarchy of standers" where the king is the "superior stander" and divine intermediary while the people are the inferior stander who are recipients of the divine message from the king.

[84] See ASV, KJV, NASB, NIV, NJB, NLT, NRSV, RSV (cf. JPS, NAB, NKJV).

(3) in Hezekiah's reign, to avert Yahweh's anger (through cultic reform),[87] and (4) in Josiah's reign, to obey the words of the book of the covenant. All of these covenants are, despite their different presentations, renewals of the Sinaitic covenant. It is unclear if any of these renewals should be set apart as greater than the others. Certainly at least, the use of the book of the covenant in Josiah's time suggests a more comprehensive and informed covenant renewal ceremony in which the entire prescriptions are clearly available to the king and the people in the "book of the covenant" (ספר הברית) and it also seems to prepare for, even makes possible, the subsequent Passover, which serves as an epitome of proper cultic worship. So, in these senses, it seems to improve upon the previous covenant renewal ceremonies.

---

[85] In Asa's reign, the people covenant "to seek Yahweh, God of their fathers, with all their heart and with all their soul" (לדרש את־יהוה אלהי אבותיהם בכל־לבבם ובכל־נפשם in 15:12) and the penalty of death is invoked for anyone who fails to observe the covenant (15:13).

[86] In Joash's reign, Jehoiada makes a covenant between himself, the people, and the king with the aim "to remain Yahweh's people" (להיות לעם ליהוה in 23:16).

[87] In Hezekiah's reign, Hezekiah expresses his desire to make a covenant to Yahweh "so his fierce anger might turn away from us" (וישב ממנו חרון אפו in 29:10). This covenant, although it ultimately shares an ideological function common to the other covenants, is quite peculiar in several respects. First, on the surface of it, it does not seem that the covenant is solemnized; it is introduced only as a desire on the part of Hezekiah and then seems abandoned in the narrative. Second, Hezekiah expresses his desire to make a covenant *to Yahweh*, which poses a significant difficulty in that it suggests either that Hezekiah's desire is not to renew the Sinaitic covenant but, in fact, to solemnize a new covenant or that the view that I have laid out above concerning the Chr's presentation of the Sinaitic covenant is incorrect. Both difficulties, however, are resolved if, as Japhet, *Ideology*, 112-115, suggests, ברית ("covenant") is taken in this context to have the sense of an oath, similar to the oath to Yahweh made by the people in Asa's reign (2 Chr 15:14). This reading is supported by the context in that Hezekiah's statement seems intimately connected to the subsequent narrative and yet Yahweh never appears in the narrative to participate either as a party to a new covenant or to remake the Sinaitic covenant. In the subsequent narrative, the king proposes to uphold and obey Yahweh's commandments through thorough cultic reform, specifically a cooperative undertaking of the Levites, priests, and king to purify and sanctify themselves and the temple. Then, similar to the events in Asa's time, there is a celebration (2 Chr 15:14-15//29:27-30), accompanied by trumpets and singers, and a concluding note of Yahweh's blessing upon the whole enterprise (2 Chr 15:15b//29:36). The context and these similarities suggest that Hezekiah's covenant to Yahweh is, in fact, an oath to renew the pre-existent Sinaitic covenant, in this case worked out through cultic renewal.

3.6 The Passover

While the finding of the book of the law is a unique and critical event in the Josiah narrative, the account of the Passover is the ultimate event of the narrative. From a structural and literary perspective, as seen in the last chapter, the narrative builds to this event and the Chr's description and theological evaluation of it set it apart as the premier cultic festival in the entire history of the monarchy.

Much as the people come to appropriate the king's programme of Yahwistic worship, the Passover begins as Josiah's initiative but then is appropriated by the people. In 35:1, it states that Josiah carried out (עשה) a Passover (פסח). In 35:16, it is stated that the Passover (פסח) was completed (עשה) in accordance with the command of King Josiah (במצות המלך יאשיהו). In 35:17, starting the evaluation of the Passover, the emphasis shifts from the performance of the Passover by Josiah, or according to the command of Josiah, to its performance by the Israelites (בני־ישראל). So, just as the inclusio of 34:2b//33b starts with the king and moves to corporate appropriation by the people, this inclusio starts with the king initiating the Passover and then states the corporate appropriation of that act. Still, by contrast, the last statement of the Passover inclusio in 35:18 concludes the account with stress upon the importance of the act itself irrespective of its performers.

The Passover in Josiah's reign is one among five festivals reported in Chronicles. The other festivals are the Sukkoth festival and dedication of the temple in Solomon's reign (2 Chr 7), the Weeks festival in Asa's reign (2 Chr 15), the re-dedication of the temple in Hezekiah's reign (2 Chr 29), and the Passover in Hezekiah's reign (2 Chr 30). Each of these festivals is intimately related to the theme of covenant that was analyzed in the foregoing sections.[88] Drawing on and

---

[88] Solomon's festival celebrates the fulfilment of the Davidic covenant and the consecrated temple while the other festivals are all related to Sinaitic covenant renewal.

slightly modifying De Vries's analysis of festivals in Chronicles, it is possible to identify four core characteristics that are shared in each of these accounts: (1) a date formulation, (2) a report on the ritual preparations, (3) the festival report proper, and (4) a theological evaluation or a statement concerning the "holy joy" experienced by the participants.[89]

The date formulation for the Josiah Passover is something of a pre-occupation for the Chr as it is stressed time and again in the statements that enwrap the narrative. In v.1, the Chr identifies the date as the fourteenth day of the first month and, looking back to 34:8 as well as forward to 35:19, the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign. In 35:17-18, relative temporal markers emphasize again the temporal location of the events on that specific day and at that specific time. The structural relevance of this pre-occupation has already been considered in the last chapter; but, the literary-ideological significance should also be explored. The emphasis on the date must undoubtedly be understood in light of the Hezekiah Passover, which was celebrated on the fourteenth day of the second month in order to accomodate the ritual impurity of the priests and those coming to Jerusalem (30:2-3). The Josiah Passover, by contrast, takes place on the accepted date.[90]

At this juncture, it is enough to note that the date formulation already distinguishes the Josiah Passover from the Hezekiah Passover in a significant, qualitative way; the Josiah Passover takes place on the legislated day. This almost polemical quality to the account vis-à-vis the Hezekiah Passover, however, is only superficial because the Josiah narrative actually normalizes many of the cultic innovations present in the Hezekiah Passover. The centralization of the Passover festival, the intermediary roles for the priests and Levites, and the assimilation of the

---

[89] Simon J. De Vries, "Festival Ideology in Chronicles" in *Problems in Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 105-108.

[90] Consequently, the Hezekiah Passover ought to be seen as the Chr's reflections on Num 9, where Moses, like Hezekiah, presides over a Passover in the second month, while the Josiah Passover ought to be seen as the Chr's reflections on Ex 12 and Deut 16. On Hezekiah's Passover and its relationship to Num 9, see esp. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 154-159.

practice of performing burnt offerings at the same time as the Passover are all brought forward from the Hezekiah Passover into the Josiah Passover. In the Josiah Passover, these innovations are not justified, as some are in the Hezekiah Passover, on account of the ritual impurity of the leaders and congregants.[91] Rather, beginning with the date formulation, the Chr places great emphasis on the Josiah Passover as an exemplary fulfillment of the precepts laid down by Moses, David, and Solomon—the cultic founders and preeminent cultic authorities (35:4, 6, 12, 15).[92] Furthermore, by way of the Chr's repeated insistence that the Passover was performed at the king's initiative and in accordance with the king's command (35:1, 10, 16), Josiah is associated with these cultic founders and so recognized as a cultic authority who legitimately transformed the Passover on the basis of Torah.[93]

These emphases are present and given further resonance throughout the narrative as the Chr recounts the preparations (35:1-9), the festival proper (35:10-16), and provides a theological evaluation (35:17-19). In these parts, the Chr focuses heavily on the roles of the priests and Levites and appropriates past traditions to create a portrait of an ideal, centralized Passover celebration. For the account, the Chr inherits and works with the divergent traditions of the Passover in Ex 12 and Deut 16 and reads into the traditions roles for priests and Levites, already introduced in the Hezekiah Passover and likely inspired by the roles for priests and Levites in the so-called P corpus of the HB.[94] The Chr also assimilates to the Passover festival, as in the Hezekiah Passover, the practice of performing burnt offerings (עלה) as prescribed in Lev 1 and Num 28-29. In this sense, the Josiah Passover is a fascinating example of what Sarna and Fishbane term "Inner Biblical Exegesis."[95]

---

[91] See 2 Chr 30:3, 15, 17-20, on the ritual impurity of leaders and congregants in Hezekiah's reign.

[92] De Vries, "Moses and David," 619-639.

[93] Contra Mitchell, "Ironic Death", who regards Josiah's performance of the Passover as the sin that justifies his death at the hands of Neco and that Josiah's usurpation of authority (as ascribed in 35:10//16) is clear evidence of this.

[94] See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 137-143; Japhet, *Chronicles*, 1044-1055.

[95] Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, vii-viii.

For a community committed to the faithful execution of law, the two Passover celebrations in the Torah pose several significant problems. The Passover in Ex 12:1-14 is a decentralized festival in which families take an animal from either their sheep or their goats, slaughter it, prepare it "roasted in fire" (צלי אש), and eat it in their own homes. Furthermore, participants are prohibited from preparing it "boiled from boiling in water" (בשל מבשל במים). By contrast, the Passover in Deut 16:1-7 is a centralized festival in which an animal is taken from the flock (צאן) or the herd (בקר), slaughtered, boiled (בשל), and eaten at the place where Yahweh chooses to put his name, which is the temple (though not explicitly mentioned as such in this passage). Obviously, the Chr supports the Dtn centralization of the festival in the temple but there is a clear *Tendenz* on the part of the Chr to accomodate the prescriptions in both Ex 12 and Deut 16 and, in turn, explicate the precise roles for the cultic functionaries of the temple, the priests and Levites, which are not mentioned in either tradition.

The ritual preparations for the Passover are reported as a series of instructions given by Josiah to the priests and Levites (35:2-6) and a report of the provisions for the Passover provided by the king, his officials, and the cultic functionaries (35:7-9). The instructions given by Josiah to the priests are recorded succintly as past statements; the text simply states that Josiah assigned the priests to their posts and encouraged them to do their duty in the temple of Yahweh (35:2). The instructions given by Josiah to the Levites, on the other hand, are developed in a speech and extensive by comparison.

Before Josiah's speech starts, however, the Chr interestingly characterizes the Levites as המבונים [המבינים] לכל ישראל הקדושים ליהוה (35:3).[96] In this construction, it is unclear whether הקדושים "the holy ones or things" refers to the things taught by the Levites to all

---

[96] As presently discussed an English translation of this phrase is not easily determined, the phrase could be read as (1) "those who taught to all Israel the holy things of Yahweh," (2) "those who taught all Israel and the holy ones of God," (3) "those who taught all Israel and who were holy to God," or (4) "those who taught all Israel, the holy ones of God."

Israel, identifies a group in addition to "all Israel" whom the Levites taught, sets apart the Levites themselves as holy ones, or distinguishes "all Israel" as holy ones. In any case, at the core of the whole statement is the affirmation that a central levitical task is teaching, which echoes the narrative in 2 Chr 17:7-9. This identification is part of the transformation of the Levites from bearers of the ark in a wandering cult to their roles in a centralized, temple cult. Indeed, the instructions that Josiah gives them implement and confirm this and other aspects of the transformation.

The direct speech (35:2-6), only the second time that Josiah speaks in the narrative, begins with a command for the Levites to put the ark in the temple that Solomon built and set themselves to the task of serving Yahweh and the people. Commentators have frequently remarked on the unusualness of this command in light of the fact that it is unclear whether, even why, the reader should assume that the ark was not in its place in the temple.[97] This seems the wrong question to ask; the focus of the text is not actually on the ark but rather, as already mentioned, on the transformation of the levitical office. Through the command, Josiah brings to an end the levitical task to bear the ark in congruity with David's command (1 Chr 23:25-26). This is part of the teleological centralization and development of the cult in Chronicles and contributes to the transformation of the levitical office to one that more closely resembles the post-exilic situation without an ark of the covenant.

The command to serve the people and Yahweh that follows the command to put the ark in the temple is given specific application in a series of commands that concern levitical duties in the upcoming service. The Levites are told to "prepare yourselves" (הכונו) and "stand" (עמדו) in the sanctuary and "slaughter" (שחטו) the paschal sacrifice, "remain consecrated" (והתקדשו), and

---

[97] See, e.g., Menahem Haran, "The Disappearance of the Ark," *IEJ* 13, no. 1 (1963): 46-58; Japhet, *Chronicles*, 1047-1048; Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 326; H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCB; Grand Rapids and London: Eerdmans and Marshall Morgan & Scott Publishing, 1982), 405.

"prepare" (הכינו) the paschal sacrifice (35:3-6). The instructions, themselves, are not unusual, especially in light of Num 3-9 and the development of the levitical office in Chronicles as a whole. The real importance in the instructions lies with the cultic authorities invoked to legitimate them. Josiah refers to the writings of David and Solomon as the foundation for the first two instructions and cites the word of Yahweh through Moses as the basis for the last three instructions. This impressive and unique invocation provides unparalleled legitimation to the upcoming service and also the performance of the Levites in it.

Building on this, the provisions for the Passover further amplify the extraordinary nature of the service. Four groups make contributions: the king (35:7), the king's officials (35:8a), the chief priests (35:8b), and the chief Levites (35:9). Astonishingly, excluding only Solomon's contributions for the temple dedication (20,000 cattle and 120,000 sheep; 2 Chr 7:5), Josiah's contributions (3000 cattle and 30,000 sheep) exceed those made by any other king, even taken together with those made by any of their officials, for any other festival (1 Chr 29:21; 2 Chr 1:6, 15:11, 17:11, 29:33), including the contributions made by Hezekiah and his officials for their Passover (2000 cattle and 17,000 sheep; 2 Chr 30:24).[98] The generous contributions are an undeniable pointer to the envisioned size of the ceremony and its significance. It is, therefore, clear that the Chr presents the Josiah Passover as the greatest cultic festival since the inauguration of the temple itself.

The provisions for the sacrifices provided by the king might already suggest at a cursory reading the Chr's preference for the Dtn Passover vis-à-vis the celebration in Exodus. Clearly, the familial celebration of the Passover is not in view yet and the provision of cattle (בקר), while consistent with Deut 16, stands in considerable tension with Ex 12, which prescribes that paschal sacrifices come only from the sheep or the goats (מן הכבשים ומן העזים), that is flock (צאן) and

---

[98] Curiously though, the amount given by Josiah's officials is not mentioned and the priests and Levites give less (7600 sheep and 800 cattle) than Hezekiah's officials (10,000 sheep and 1000 cattle; 2 Chr 30:24).

not cattle (בקר). The Chr, however, is unmistakably aware of the tension and makes a subtle yet also quite precise accomodation to the Exodus tradition. This accomodation is evident in the report of the provisions itself as the Chr writes that the king gave to the laity a flock of sheep and kids (צאן כבשים ובני עזים), which corresponds to the prescription in Ex 12:5 and which the Chr immediately qualifies as constituting "everything for the paschal sacrifices for all those present" (הכל לפסחים לכל־הנמצא). Only after this important qualification does the Chr report the amount of the flock and, subsequent to this, the provision and amount of cattle. This precision leaves little doubt that the cattle are not paschal sacrifices. This distinction is also present in the reports of the provisions by the priests for the priests and the provisions by the Levites for the Levites, though in abbreviated form. In each case, the Chr reports the number of paschal sacrifices (לפסחים) and then the cattle (בקר).[99] The cattle, therefore, are separate provisions for the "consecrated offerings" (הקדשים), mentioned in 35:13, and more generally for the non-paschal burnt offerings and freewill offerings that accompany the Passover festival and the Feast of Unleavened Bread that follows it.

The festival proper (35:10-16) expectedly continues to amplify the extraordinary nature of the service; it also continues to reconcile Ex 12 and Deut 16. In this regard, the roles for the priests and Levites play a central role in the Chr's attempt to bring together the familial orientation of the Passover in Ex 12 with the centralization described in Deut 16 and necessarily foregrounded in this account. It is interesting, in fact, that the Chr is even concerned with this issue at all for one would assume that the existence of the temple is, in itself, sufficient

---

[99] Most English translations are guilty of a significant travesty that obliterates this distinction (see e.g. ASV, KJV, NASB, NJB, NJPS, NKJV, NLT, NRSV, RSV; cf. NAB and NIV, the most notable exceptions). In 35:8-9, the provisions are reported in a standardized form with the structure: givers – verb of giving – "for paschal sacrifices" (לפסחים) – amount – "and cattle" (ובקר) – amount. Most translators evidently made the assumption that an object noun for the small livestock, such as flock, sheep, or kids, had been omitted in the text between "for paschal sacrifices" (לפסחים) and the first amount and thus they incorrectly concluded that "for paschal sacrifices" (לפסחים) circumscribes and identifies both amounts as paschal sacrifices rather than just the first amount, as should be done.

prerogative to regard the decentralized Passover in Ex 12 as superseded by the instructions in Deut 16. The interest in accomodation, therefore, reveals the total authority of the Torah for the Chr and also the Chr's community.

Again, the Chr overcomes the tensions by accommodating both traditions in the narrative. This is possible because of certain ambiguities in Ex 12 and Deut 16. On the one hand, the narrative in Ex 12 does not explicitly state where the sacrifice must be made or who must perform it; it only specifies the manner in which it must be eaten and used.[100] On the other hand, Deut 16 emphasizes the place where the sacrifice must occur but makes no specifications regarding how it is used and remains imprecise as to who must make the sacrifice. Given these ambiguities, the Levites are given an intermediary role in 35:11-13, consistent with Num 3-9 (esp. ch.8), 18 and Ezek 44, as well as the precedent the Chr created in 2 Chr 30, to slaughter, flay, and prepare the paschal sacrifices and consecrated offerings, consistent with the centralization in Deut 16, and then to give the burnt offerings to "the family divisions of the laity to offer to Yahweh" and to distribute the paschal offerings to the laity to eat and use as prescribed in Ex 12. The priestly role, by contrast, is entirely explainable by the Chr's assimilation of the practice of burnt offerings in Lev 1 to the Passover festival, which prescribes that the priests sprinkle the blood and burn the burnt offerings and fatty parts received from the laity.

On the apparent contradiction concerning whether to "roast in fire" (צלי אש) or to "boil" (בשל) the paschal lamb, the Chr once again attempts to overcome the tension through an accomodation to both Ex 12 and Deut 16.[101] In 2 Chr 35:13, the Chr reports that "they boiled the

---

[100] There is perhaps even a hint of centralization in Ex 12 in v.6, which reads, "You must keep it till the fourteenth day of the month when the whole assembly of the community of Israel will slaughter it at twilight" (NJB). Still, the intent of this verse more likely stresses that each household slaughtered the paschal sacrifice at the same time, that is as a whole assembly, rather than suggesting that the whole community assembled to slaughter the paschal sacrifices.

[101] Some commentators alleviate the tension by simply opting to read בשל as "to cook." While this is one potential solution, there are significant reasons to reject this approach in part for the reason shortly discussed. See Ben Zvi, "'Boiling in Fire'", 1-14; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 134-137, for a more detailed rejection of this solution.

paschal lamb in fire according to Misphat [a judgment]" (ויבשלו הפסח באש כמשפט). It is significant that the Chr attributes the decision to boil the paschal lamb to a judgment rather than a more direct appeal to the book of Moses to legitimate the obvious accomodation; this distinction strongly suggests that the tension between Ex 12 and Deut 16 was perceived as a problem by the Chr (or among earlier communities) and required a judgment in order to ensure total compliance with both traditions.

The determination and its rationale is evident from the solution. In typical Midrashic style, the solution utilizes gaps and ambiguities in both passages.[102] From Ex 12, it is determined that only a particular type of boiling is prohibited, i.e. "boiling in water" (בשל במים). From the Chr's logic, therefore, it stems to reason that it is otherwise acceptable to boil the paschal lamb, as long as it is not "in water" (במים). This determination in itself already eliminates the tension between Ex 12 and Deut 16 insofar as it concerns the issue of boiling in water because Deut 16 does not explicitly prescribe boiling in water; it only prescribes boiling.

Further rationale, however, is required to alleviate the tension between boiling (בשל) and roasting in fire (צלי אש), two clearly different culinary techniques with the former by definition requiring a substance in which the food is boiled, and this the Chr provides through the prepositional phrase "in fire" (באש). As Ben Zvi observes,

> [T]he result of this required exegetical exercise is that the [paschal lamb] had to be boiled in something other than water. This 'something' is represented by the X in the common expression X-ב-בשל [boil-in-X] in which X normally stands for either water or milk ... The [Chr's] solution to this dilemma is to develop an abstract understanding of X as the substance that encircles, penetrates and actually cooks the meat. Such an understanding allows him to create an expression coined in the same way [as] בשל במים [boil in water], but which stands in clear contrast to it, namely בשל באש [boil in fire]. Thus the [Chr] expands the semantic meaning of 'boil' to include not only boiling in water or milk, but also boiling in fire, which in practice is roasting, that is that which is prescribed in [Ex] 12:9.[103]

---

[102] Ben Zvi, "'Boiling in Fire'", 1-14.
[103] Ben Zvi, "'Boiling in Fire'", 8-9.

Thus, "the [Chr is] able to fulfill at the same time all the prescriptions of the relevant texts and uphold the rituals celebrated in the temple."[104]

The narrative of the Josiah Passover closes with a report of how the Levites provided for the priests, who continued to make the burnt offerings, (35:14) and their brothers, the singers and gatekeepers (35:15); the singers the Chr identifies as at their assigned places in accordance with the command of David, Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun (35:15), a back reference to 1 Chr 25. This addendum to the festival report proper is not meant to celebrate the Levites, especially not over and against the priests, as some have held for the Passover narrative as a whole; this potential inference is not warranted.[105] Instead, this addendum serves to amplify the extraordinary and well-ordered and active nature of the service, further depict the practice of performing burnt offerings in the Passover service, and stress again the importance of the intermediary role of the Levites to a centralized cultic festival. There is no polemical tone to the addendum nor are the Levites explicitly praised for their diligence.

The conclusion to the Passover narrative confirms that the entire service, the Passover and the burnt offerings, were completed that day in accordance with the king's command and makes a reference to the celebration of the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the seven days after the Passover (34:16-17). The theological evaluation of the Passover (34:18), the last of the four core characteristics of festivals in Chronicles, consists of two declarative statements that set the Josiah Passover apart from any that preceded since the days of Samuel the prophet and like no other performed by any of the kings of Israel and Judah. The incomparability of the Passover is most certainly related to its centralization and its extraordinary and well-ordered performance in

---

[104] Ben Zvi, "'Boiling in Fire'", 9.

[105] For an analysis of the pro-priestly and pro-levitical positions on Chronicles, as well as a more sensitive alternative reading of the relationship between priests and Levites in Chronicles, see esp. Gary N. Knoppers, "Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood," *JBL* 118, no. 1 (1999): 49-72.

compliance with all the precepts established by all the great luminaries, from Moses to David and Solomon to Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun to Hezekiah, in the history of the cult.

This Passover, therefore, represents in Chronicles the fullest expression of the cult in the monarchic period, which the Davidic dynasty was tasked to establish, and the service to which the temple and its functionaries are dedicated. Particularly instructive is the Chr's proclamation that "all the service of Yahweh was prepared that day" (תכון כל עבודת יהוה ביום ההוא). Although this summation is primarily a conclusion to the Passover account, as the prepositional clauses that follow it indicate, the phrase has a certain resonance with 1 Chr 28:20: "And David said to his son Solomon, 'Be strong and resolute. Have no fear nor be dismayed. For Yahweh God, my god, is with you. He will not fail you and he will not forsake you until all the work of the service of Yahweh's house [כל מלאכת עבודת בית יהוה] is completed.'" This resonance, along with the theological evaluation and the Chr's transition to the account of Josiah's death in 34:20, signals the completion of the Davidic role in establishing the cult and so augurs the end of the dynasty.

Chapter 4

Of Prophets and Monarchs: The Death of Josiah

Whereas the last chapter focused on the reign of Josiah, this chapter will, utilizing a similar approach, analyze the death of Josiah. The central narrative that reports Josiah's death is 2 Chr 35:20-25/27. Still, the Chr's account of Josiah's reign from 2 Chr 33:25–35:19 contributes to this narrative in numerous ways. As the Chr foregrounds Josiah's development and transformation of the cult in 2 Chr 34:1–35:19, several elements, aided by subtexts, emerge that contextualize and give deeper meaning to Josiah's death, and augur the Judean exile, within the world of the narrative.[106] Throughout, the Chr interweaves allusions to and stories of prophets and monarchs. The Chr's story-telling abilities are perhaps at their most rich and poignant as the Chr deftly negotiates the dual ends of the Josiah narrative, that is the development of the cult and Josiah's death, with potent irony.

4.1 The Pall

As already noted in the last chapter, a constant pall hangs over the Chr's account of Josiah's reign. This pall strikes a dramatically different tone for the Josiah narrative than the tone

---

[106] I am using the term "subtexts" here as defined by Michael Riffaterre, *Fictional Truth* (eds. Stephen G. Nichols et al.; Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1990), xvii-xviii, who writes, "Symbolism raises the problem of the gap between the metalinguistic structure of its referentiality, the sequential telling of the story, and the hierarchy of esthetic values that make the novel into an artifact. What accounts for the bridging of the gap, it seems to me, is the presence of subtexts, texts within the text that are neither subplots nor themes but diegetic pieces whose sole function is to be vehicles of symbolism. They offer a rereading of the plot that points to its significance in a discourse closer to poetry to narrative ... there is an unconscious of the text that works like the human unconscious. This unconscious of the text is represented by the symbolism of the subtext and by the intertext this symbolism mobilizes. Readers accede to it not by plumbing the innermost recesses of the psyche, but by following the clues of the text itself."

that characterizes the reigns of the other good kings in Chronicles. It creates a sense of apprehension even amidst the king's positive contributions to the religious life of Israel. There is little reason in the Josiah narrative to hope. The pall is palatable through the absence of the joy and blessing paradigms, the spectre of exile, the finding of the book of the law, the encounter with Huldah, and the despondency of the king.

Of the chief characteristics in Chronicles, two that are central to the entire narrative are joy in worship, celebration, and volitional giving and Yahweh's blessings in response to the faithfulness of king and people. Over and again, the Chr calls to attention the joy of the people in worship, celebration, and volitional giving (1 Chr 12:41, 15:16, 25, 16:10, 31, 29:9, 17, 22; 2 Chr 6:41, 7:10, 15:15, 20:27, 23:13, 18, 21, 24:10, 29:30, 36, 30:21, 23, 25-26). Joy is present in the reigns of the majority of good kings and characterizes the people in nearly every major Yahwistic reform or festival. Similarly, the Chr makes repeated references to Yahweh's blessings upon either king or people commensurate with their faithfulness. These blessings may include, as outlined in the last chapter in section 3.5, produce, peace, victory against enemies, fertility, and restoration after exile. But, these are all strikingly absent from the Josiah narrative, even though the narrative retells a story of one of Israel's greatest kings and consists of some of the most thorough and comprehensive reforms and greatest ceremonies and festivals in the entire history of the monarchy. As Halpern writes,

> Simply, from David to Hezekiah, Chronicles regards and bestows abundance as a mark of divine favor ... the motifs of nearness to god, of salvation, and of expansion, growth, and accumulation all merge into a single complex, characterized by the rest motif ... From Manasseh onward, the whole rest/prosperity/salvation complex disappears.[107]

---

[107] Baruch Halpern, "Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure-Indications of an Earlier Source" in *The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text* (ed. Richard E. Friedman; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 40-41.

Instead, it is the spectre of exile and, in the Josiah narrative, the despondency of the king that holds the reader's attention.

As put forward in the last chapter, "the rest of Israel" (שארית ישראל in 34:9) and "the buildings which the kings of Judah destroyed" (הבתים אשר השחיתו מלכי יהודה in 34:11) operate primarily on the phraseological level to portray Josiah as a type of Solomon. This contributes to the primary telos of the Josiah narrative, which is the consummation of the cult in the monarchic period, by drawing together temple builder and temple rebuilder in the same narrative.[108] However, as language that is a part of the discourse of exile, the Chr also pre-figures the exile. It is significant in this respect that the Chr attributes the destruction of the temple buildings to "the kings of Judah," a totality that potentially indicts Josiah as much as it does the king's predecessors. The Chr creates a latent subtext that at the same time it attributes to Josiah the role as temple builder also undercuts and denies Josiah the ascription. The kings of Judah are destroyers even as they are builders. Even as kingdoms unite and build up, the spectre of exile threatens to disperse and destroy them; the very rhythms of time conspire against them—a point the Chr accentuates in Josiah's death.

Similarly, the finding of the book of the law in 34:14-15 serves the main narrative thread that leads to the consummation of the cult while its introduction to the narrative also concretizes justification for an exile. Both intentions operate on the primary level. As subtext, the book of the law is a symbol that foregrounds the discourse of covenant and as such reinforces what is actualized on the primary level. The book of the law precipitates the covenant renewal, serves as its theological basis, and also informs the Passover. This is made apparent by the references to the book in 34:30-31 and 35:12 and the words of the book in 35:6. Yet, at the same time, it also

---

[108] By using the term "consummation" here and elsewhere, I do not mean to imply the ultimate completion of the cult for all time but only its completion/perfection in the monarchic period, which serves as an ideal model for the inheritors of these traditions. The Chr would, in my opinion, conceive of the cult in terms that required constant developments and transformation in light of contemporary events but also consistent with past traditions.

exposes the failure of king and people to keep covenant, reflected by Josiah's contrition and commission to seek out Yahweh in 34:19-21, and serves as the theological basis for an imminent cataclysm prophesied by Huldah in 34:22-28 (N.B. v.24).

In Josiah's commission to seek out Yahweh (34:21), the spectre of exile is invoked again. Josiah orders a group of officials to "go and seek Yahweh on [his] behalf and on behalf of those who remain in Israel and in Judah" (לכו דרשו את יהוה בעדי ובעד הנשאר בישראל וביהודה). The phrase "those who remain in Israel and in Judah" (הנשאר בישראל וביהודה) echoes the earlier reference to "the rest of Israel" (שארית ישראל). The verbal root "to remain" (שאר) within the context of Chronicles, like its nominal שארית, is an ideologically nuanced word that conveys post-exilic connotations of a remnant. Further, the Chr now explicitly draws Judah into the exilic discourse, such that Josiah seems to situate himself and the people in the exilic age; and, rather than seeking out Yahweh to prevent an exile, Josiah seeks Yahweh to abate that which has already started.

Huldah's prophecy in 34:22-28 actualizes the spectre of exile pre-figured in the account of the temple repairs and Josiah's speech. Prophecies of the post-Solomonic era in Chronicles conform to one of two generic types: they pronounce a judgment (2 Chr 12:5, 16:7-10, 18:16, 19:2-3, 20:13-17, 20:37, 21:12-15, 25:15-16) or provide Yahweh's perspective on an action contemplated or in process (2 Chr 11:3-4, 15:1-7, 18:19-22, 24:19-22, 25:7-9, 28:9-11). In relation to the book of the law, as argued in the last chapter, Huldah's prophecy confirms the message of the book; it pronounces a judgment.[109] Yahweh promises through the voice of Huldah to bring upon the people "all the curses that are written in the book read before the king of Judah" and states that his wrath will not subside. The exile, therefore, is transformed from spectre to immanent judgment.

---

[109] The message is negative insofar as its threatens exile. However, insofar as it reveals the will of Yahweh and brings an awareness of sin, it is a positive message.

Huldah's prophecy also directly concerns Josiah's death. Through the voice of Huldah, Yahweh says of Josiah, "Behold, I am gathering you to your fathers and you will be gathered to your graves in peace (בשלום) and your eyes will not look on all the evil that I am bringing upon this place and upon its inhabitants" (34:28). The promise to Josiah is undeniably bittersweet for the promise extends only to him and actually reiterates again the judgment pronounced upon the people. It also inspires one of the Chr's central ironies concerning the death of Josiah, as we shall see shortly.

The last element of the narrative to contribute to the pall is the despondency of the king. Huldah's prophecy amplifies this element, which begins with the king's desperate response to the words of the book. In response to its words, the king tears his clothes (34:19). In Huldah's prophecy, Yahweh acknowledges that Josiah has not only torn his clothes but also wept before him (34:27). Both of these emotional outbursts are unique to Josiah in Chronicles; no other king displays such expressive repentance.[110] The outbursts are the antithesis of the Chr's tendency to accentuate positive, celebratory emotions in the reigns of good kings; that is, not only is the joy paradigm absent in the Josiah narrative but it is replaced by a grief paradigm. Josiah is the king of tears; a portrayal that serves as yet another source of irony in the Chr's account of his death and eulogy.

4.2 The Death

The account of Josiah's death is a narrative with many intertextual allusions to Josiah's reign as well as the rest of Chronicles. The overwhelming effect of these allusions is a deeply

---

[110] Athaliah tears her clothes in 23:13 but in an entirely different context and on entirely selfish grounds. It is also interesting to note that, in parallel accounts to Chronicles, Kings and Isaiah report that Hezekiah tore his clothes in response to Rabshakeh's taunts and wept when he became ill to the point of death (2 Kgs 19:1 // Isa 37:1 // 2 Chr 32:20; 2 Kgs 20 // Isa 38 // 2 Chr 32:24-26); neither detail, however, is carried forward in this language by the Chr.

ironic portrayal of Josiah's last days. It also announces the consummation of the cult in the monarchic period and effectively augurs the end of the Davidic monarchy in Judah and Israel. In this respect, the narrative has unique importance within the world of Chronicles.

The initial after-clause of the death narrative, "after all this" (אחרי כל זאת), is a significant literary and ideological construction. The after-clause is a relative temporal transition that, at the same time it produces discontinuity to introduce a new narrative, also establishes temporal or topical continuity between what precedes the narrative and what proceeds from it; the reader is encouraged to read the text in light of previous events and also regard subsequent events as successive or near-successive. Quite often, there is also an implied casuality.

The Chr makes use of this construction eleven other times; the six variations in the form are primarily stylistic: "and it happened afterwards" (ויהי אחרי כן in 1 Chr 18:1, 19:1, 20:4; ויהי אחריכן in 2 Chr 20:1, 24:4), "and afterwards" (ואחריכן in 2 Chr 20:35; ואחרי כן in 2 Chr 33:14), "and it happened after" (ויהי אחרי in 2 Chr 25:14), "after these deeds and faithfulness" (אחרי הדברים והאמת הזאת in 2 Chr 32:1), "after this" (אחר זה in 2 Chr 32:9), and "and after" (ואחר in 2 Chr 35:14). In seven of the eleven occurrences, the device introduces a war report. In the Davidic narratives (1 Chr 18:1, 19:1, 20:4), the repetition of the after-clause creates a sense of perpetual conflict and expansion. On the one hand, this supports the characterization of David as a man of war (1 Chr 22:8) and, on the other hand, this dramatically actualizes Yahweh's covenant promise to David to subdue all his enemies (1 Chr 17:10). By contrast, in the four cases that it initiates a war report in the post-Solomonic era (2 Chr 20:1, 20:35, 32:1, 32:9), the after-clause creates tension between the generally faithful acts of the king that precede it and the threat against Israel posed by the onset of war.

Many scholars have observed that the onset of war after a period of faithfulness is inconsistent with the Chr's tendency to ascribe immediate rewards for faithfulness; faithfulness should beget peace in the world of Chronicles. Japhet explains this inconsistency with recourse to the idea of test; the invasion of foreign enemies after a period of peace is meant to challenge the

professions of loyalty and commitment made by king and people in the previous narrative.[111] While this has some currency, it seems to me that Japhet's argument falters insofar as foreign invasions are never ascribed to Yahweh unless they are punishments and the language of test is not explicitly used in any of these cases. Certainly, the exegete might be tempted to infer that the Chr's theodicy naturally demands that it is Yahweh who directs events but the absence of the language of test is a tougher dilemma to overcome. The language of test occurs only twice in Chronicles: in the story of the Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon to test him with difficult questions (2 Chr 9:1) and in the story of the Babylonian embassy's visit to Hezekiah in which Yahweh is said to have left Hezekiah alone in order to test him (2 Chr 32:31). The absence of the language of test in the war reports suggests that something else is likely at play in these narratives. If, in the case of the Davidic narratives, the after-clause points to Yahweh's covenant promise to David, perhaps there is also a more explicit explanation for these conflicts in the text itself.

The first war report in the post-Solomonic era is the most natural place to find such an explanation as it sets the precedent for the subsequent narratives. This war report occurs in Rehoboam's reign and depicts Shishak's invasion (2 Chr 12:1-12). Although this war report shares the same topos of invasion by a foreign army, it is explicitly ascribed to the unfaithfulness of king and people; it is a punishment. When king and people are confronted by Yahweh's prophet, they humble themselves in the face of the threat and consequently Yahweh gives them some deliverance. Yahweh makes a pledge to king and people through the prophet: "They have humbled themselves. I will not destroy them. I will give to them a little reprieve and my wrath will not pour out against Jerusalem by the hand of Shishak; instead they will be his servants and they will know my service and the service of the kingdoms of the lands" (2 Chr 12:7-8; cf. 2 Chr

---

[111] See, among others, Japhet, *Ideology*, 191-198.

9:26). This promise fundamentally alters the political dynamic in the post-Solomonic era by conceding the historical reality of Judah's vassalage. Moreover, it seems almost certain by the plural "kingdoms of the lands" (ממלכות הארצות) that the Chr presents the inauguration of a long-term political situation by which numerous foreign kings will rule the people. The passage also implies that this development is intended not simply to make known to the people Yahweh's service and the service of foreign kings but the difference between them.

If the invasions of foreign kings in Chronicles, therefore, are understood in light of Judah's vassalage, it suggests that the invasions are not so much a test of king and people but rather are intended to contrast the preceeding service of Yahweh, which yields successes and blessings, with the proceeding service of the kingdoms of the lands, which threaten, pillage, destroy, and take away. It is only, as Japhet argues, a test of king and people in a very limited and not altogether very instructive sense; that is, it is a test only insofar, as in all circumstances, the king and people are expected to demonstrate their primary fealty to Yahweh. For the Chr, faithfulness should characterize the true Yahwist in good and evil times. Indeed, three of the remaining four occurrences of the after-clause (2 Chr 24:4, 25:14, 33:14), which do not initiate a war report, also convey similar contrasts between the consequences of fidelity and infidelity. The after-clause then in the account of Josiah's death immediately sets the ominous tone of the narrative. The Chr conditions readers to expect an event in contrast to the preceding, positive events, which will likely take the form of an invasion by a foreign king.

There is yet more significance to the after-clause, conveyed by the referent "all this" (כל זאת). In the subordinate clause in apposition to the after-clause, the Chr clarifies that "all this" refers to "when Josiah had prepared the temple" (אשר הכין יאשיהו את הבית). This is a somewhat ambigious referent. The Chr commonly identifies temple service as preparations for the temple itself and, therefore, using the key word "to prepare" (כון) from the Passover narrative and placing this referent in literary proximity to that narrative, the most immediate referent is the Passover. Additionally, the Chr likely makes reference to the temple precisely to

encase in the referent the entire events in Josiah's eighteenth year that began with the temple repairs. Moreover, there is a certain finality to the preparations for the temple implied in the Passover evaluation and, indeed, the whole account of Josiah's reign, who variously embodies the characters and authority of Moses, David, Solomon, and Hezekiah. Idolatry is purged, the temple is built, the book of the law is present in the community, king and people are bound in a covenant to Yahweh, the whole service of Yahweh is prepared, and the service is the greatest in the entire history of the Davidic dynasty.

Amplified by the particle "all" (כל), "all this" can then envelop the entire cultic history as epitomized in Josiah's extensive preparations for the temple. This reading suggests that this is the ultimate turning point in Chronicles; it signals a radical change in the whole purpose of the narrative, marking the terminus ad quem of the development of the cult in the monarchic period and, consequently, the terminus ad quem of Yahweh's promise, given through David to Solomon, to never fail or forsake the king until "all the work of the service of the temple of Yahweh" was complete (1 Chr 28:20). Again, this strikes an ominous tone for the narrative that proceeds from the *after-clause*. The Chr transitions from positive to threatening events and, at the same time, while announcing the consummation of the cult in the monarchic period, introduces the spectre that Yahweh can now leave the king because his promise is fulfilled.

Still, some hope prevails in that this after-clause most immediately invokes the parallel formula in the Hezekiah narrative in 2 Chr 32:1 and 32:9. There is a close affinity developed and clearly intended between Josiah and Hezekiah in Chronicles. Both kings oversee or engage in similar activities, temple repairs, purges, reforms, and festivals, and both kings stand out among the post-Solomonic kings as most clearly conforming to the Davidic and Solomonic types. Indeed, only these two kings are compared directly with David (2 Chr 29:2, 34:2) and many typological

connections are made that variously associate them with David or Solomon (or also Moses).[112] So then, by invoking the Hezekiah narrative in which Sennacherib invades Judah, the Chr creates, amidst the ominous tone, the hope that Josiah, as Hezekiah before him, will respond faithfully, seek and trust Yahweh, and so receive some measure of deliverance from whatever is to come.

From the complex opening of the after-clause, the Chr proceeds to set the scene. The story unfolds that Neco, the king of Egypt, went up to fight at Carchemish on the Euphrates and Josiah went out to oppose him (35:20). While the set up seems at a cursory glance quite simple, it is actually somewhat unusual. It is Josiah who initiates this conflict with a foreign monarch. In contrast to the war report in Hezekiah's reign, the foreign monarch is not attacking Judah. Neco confirms this through his messengers: "What have I to do with you, king of Judah? I am not going up against you today but against a kingdom at war with me; and God commands my hastening. Cease opposing God, who is with me, so that he will not destroy you." (35:21). Neco's message to Josiah, however, not only confirms that Josiah is the belligerent but it is also *ad hoc* prophetic speech that warns Josiah of his destruction by authority rooted in divine revelation. The contrast with Sennacherib's proud posturing and blasphemy is striking (32:9-19) and, yet even so, it is not altogether unusual in the world of Chronicles that a foreign monarch should employ the language of the Israelite cult. In fact, as Ben Zvi argues, the Chr exhibits a clear tendency to 'Israelize' the speeches of most foreign monarchs, the king of Tyre, the queen of Sheba, Neco, and Cyrus, and so in some sense appropriates the monarch.[113]

In the case of the king of Tyre and the queen of Sheba, the 'Israelization' of their speeches serves to give added weight to their subjective views concerning Solomon and also

---

[112] See De Vries, "Moses and David," 619-639; Japhet, *Chronicles*, passim; Jonker, *Reflections*, 48-60; Mark A. Throntveit, "The Relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon in the Books of Chronicles" in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein* (ed. Matt Patrick Graham et al.; London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 105-121.

[113] Ehud Ben Zvi, "When the Foreign Monarch Speaks" in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture* (ed. Matt Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 209-228.

emphasize Solomon's preeminence over even them; the relationship implied in these speeches clearly elevates Solomon and subordinates the foreign monarch. But, more than this, these leaders not only recognize and pay tribute to Solomon but in some sense are blended into Israel. The vision of the Chr is quite nearly of an ancient world in which Solomon rules Israel and the very foreignness of the other is overwhelmed and nearly nullified by the effulgent kingdom. The foreignness only exists so that the Chr can actually portray Solomon's status among the nations.

In the case of Neco and Cyrus, however, the 'Israelization' serves an entirely different purpose. These monarchs quite remarkably invoke the Israelite God to authenticate and legitimate their actions and consequently their right to authority over Judah. As such, Neco's claim that God is with him is incredible and, at least to an extent, undermines Josiah's legitimacy as ruler over Judah. This claim actualizes that which the narrative world has already hinted at through the absence of Yahweh's blessings in the Josiah narrative and the absence of any statement that God was with Josiah.[114] Plus, the spectre, mentioned earlier, that the after-clause creates now openly confronts Josiah (and the reader) in Neco's message; because Josiah has prepared the temple, Yahweh's promise to remain with the Davidic king is fulfilled and Yahweh can justly transfer authority over Judah to another house.

Neco's message, therefore, heralds a radical political realignment that occurs only two other times in the text: at Saul's death (1 Chr 10) and at the division of the kingdom (2 Chr 10). In these cases, the Chr depicts schisms between past and present political realities and attributes

---

[114] This is admittedly somewhat contentious insofar as Josiah's reforms, the temple repairs, the finding of the book, Huldah's prophecy, the covenant renewal ceremony, and the Passover can, and even should be regarded, as signs of blessing apart from any explicit statement of divine approval, contra Halpern, "Sacred History",35-56; Mitchell, "Ironic Death" ; John W. Wright, "Beyond Transcendence and Immanence: The Characterization of the Presence and Activity of God in the Book of Chronicles" in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein* (ed. Matt Patrick Graham et al.; London: T & T Clark International, 2003. Nevertheless, the absence of an explicit statement of blessing and approval so common in the reports of David and Solomon and the post-Solomonic kings up to Hezekiah must have some significance and it seems to me that this is best understood in terms of the transferal of the kingdom from the Davidic monarchy to foreign kings.

these schisms to the judgment of God. In the division of the kingdom, God brings about the separation of the northern tribes from the twelve and denies Rehoboam the right to reconstitute a unified Israel (2 Chr 10:15, 11:1-4). At Saul's death, God transfers the kingdom from Saul's house to David's house. This transfer of the kingdom is especially relevant to the present text and gives particular poignancy and irony to Neco's claim. According to the Chr, Saul dies and the kingdom transfers to David because Saul fails to fulfill Yahweh's command and fails to seek his advice (2 Chr 10:13-14). Now, Josiah, who fulfills Yahweh's command to prepare the temple and who seeks his advice through the prophet Huldah, faces a similar fate: death and the transferral of the kingdom to a foreign monarch. Of course, Neco's foreignness, and thus the apparent incredulity of the message, invites the reader, at least temporarily, to regard the message as untrustworthy—perhaps this god that Neco invokes is not Israel's God—and consequently this maintains the suspense of the narrative. Quite interestingly though, the Chr gives no indication that this foreignness affects Josiah's subsequent decision to reject Neco's warning.

At this point in the narrative, the Chr makes an even more peculiar and unexpected turn; the Chr reports in 35:22 that Josiah "disguised himself" (התחפש). The Chr employs the disguise topos to further the ironic comparison between Saul and Josiah and also introduce parallels between Ahab and Josiah. The Chr notes in 1 Chr 10:13, among the grievances against Saul that justify the transferral of the kingdom to David, that Saul consulted a medium. In turn, this note refers to the story in 2 Sam 28:4-25 in which Saul "disguises himself" (יתחפש) in order to consult a medium by stealth about a battle with the Philistines. The disguise topos is also present in 1 Kings 20:35-43 in which a prophet "disguises himself" (יתחפש) in order to conceal his identity from Ahab, the king of (northern) Israel, and so elicit from Ahab a judgment that ironically serves to indict Ahab himself and consequently justify a prophecy that Ahab will die in accordance with Yahweh's judgment. Most immediately, however, the disguise topos invokes 2 Chr 18 in which Micaiah, a prophet of Yahweh, prophesies that Ahab will not return from a battle against Ramoth-Gilead (18:14-27). Ahab, nevertheless, "disguises himself" (יתחפש) and goes into battle

anyways (18:28-29). The parallel story in 1 Kings 22 operates in conjunction with the story already cited in 1 Kings 20 to bring about Yahweh's judgment against Ahab with heightened irony.

In each relevant intertext, the story of disguise is told "at the expense of the king ... [and] it is an unacceptable line of kingship which is condemned."[115] This stands in contrast to the topos as it is presented in other ANE texts. In those texts, the topos of disguise typically allows the king to escape their divinely ordained fate.[116] The biblical inversion of the topos ultimately serves to illustrate, at least in most of these cases, that attempts to avoid divinely ordained fate are ineffective because "nothing is hidden from God's sight."[117] With these intertexts in mind then, the Chr's report that Josiah disguised himself aligns the king's actions with those of Saul and Ahab, both of whom are presented in Chronicles as well as Samuel-Kings as unfaithful and impious kings, and clearly dooms those actions to failure. It also sounds again the imminent end of the Davidic dynasty.

Next, the Chr as the trustworthy narrator authorizes Neco's message in 35:22 by stating that Josiah did not listen (לֹא שָׁמַע) to Neco's words "from the mouth of God" (מִפִּי אֱלֹהִים) and so takes for granted that Josiah ought to have adhered to them as genuine divine pronouncements. There can be no doubt now that Neco's message comes with the authority of Israel's god and, coupled with the disguise topos, this decisively ends any suspense that may yet

---

[115] Richard Coggins, "On Kings and Disguises," *JSOT* 50 (1991): 60. Coggins cites another possible intertext in 1 Kings 14 in which Jeroboam, the first king of (northern) Israel, has his wife "change" (וְהִשְׁתַּנְּתִי) herself to consult Ahijah the prophet about his son's illness. Yahweh, however, informs Ahijah of the ruse, who then prophesies the end of the Jeroboam's dynasty and the exile of northern Israel. While the verb is different, the topos is indeed the same and leads to a similar judgment against an unfaithful king.

[116] For more on this topos in the ANE, see Jean Bottéro, "The Substitute King and His Fate" in *Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 138-155; Petra M. Goedegebuure, "KBo 17.17+: Remarks on an Old Hittite Royal Substitution Ritual," *JANER* 2, no. 1 (2002): 61-73; René Labat, "Le Sort des Substituts Royaux en Assyrie au Temps des Sargonides," *RA* 40 (1945-46): 123-142; Simo Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal* (2 vols.; AOAT 5/1, 5/2; Kevelaer: Butzon and Bercker, 1970), 2: xxii-xxxii. This topos is also found in classical texts too: see, e.g., Arrian, *Anab.* 7.24.1-3; Herodotus, *Hist.* 7.15.

[117] Coggins, "On Kings and Disguises," 61.

linger in the minds of the readers. Moreover, Josiah's refusal to listen echoes events recorded by the Chr in Amaziah's reign when Amaziah goes to war against the northern Israelite king Joash (2 Chr 25:17-24). Like Josiah, Amaziah is the belligerent in the narrative and actively pursues the confrontation (2 Chr 25:17). Joash, like Neco, issues a warning that this will bring about disaster for the Judean king (2 Chr 25:18). But, like Josiah, Amaziah does not listen (לא שמע) to the warning (2 Chr 25:19). In slight contrast, the Chr does not attribute Joash's words to God—in the world of Chronicles, this is impossible because Israel's god is not with the apostate northern Israelite polity. Still, the Chr does authorize and sanction Joash's words, like Neco's, by stating that Amaziah's obstinacy is from God (מהאל הים היא) and, of course, consequently Joash defeats Amaziah in battle, takes the king and people from Judah captive, and plunders the temple (2 Chr 25:19-24). The common motif of these two narratives—the refusal to heed warnings—is a common one in Chronicles that always precipitates disaster. The only narrative tension that remains, therefore, is whether Josiah will meet a fate like Saul, Ahab, or Amaziah.

The Chr reports in 35:22 that Josiah met Neco in battle at Megiddo. In the battle report, the Chr describes the death of Josiah and again advances an ironic comparison to Saul and Ahab. Just as Saul (1 Chr 10:3, though cf. v.4) and Ahab (2 Chr 18:33) are shot by archers, it is archers who wound Josiah (2 Chr 35:23). In addition, all three kings make final appeals to their retainers: Saul asks his retainer to kill him so that he is not captured alive (2 Chr 35:4) while Ahab and Josiah both ask their retainers to take them away from the battlefield on account of their wounds ("because I am wounded," כי הוחלתי in 2 Chr 18:33 and 35:23). This, however, is the end to the parallels. The retainers of Saul and Ahab are unwilling or unable to comply with the requests made upon them and consequently Saul has to take his own life (2 Chr 10:4) and Ahab's chariot remains trapped on the battlefield (2 Chr 18:34) while, by contrast, Josiah's retainer successfully carries out the king's request (2 Chr 35:24). Consequently, unlike these unfaithful and impious kings, Josiah does not die on the battlefield but he is returned to Jerusalem, and only then dies.

In Jerusalem, Josiah is gathered to the graves of his fathers (35:24). This provides the ironical fulfillment of Huldah's prophecy. As Mitchell points out, the Chr puns Huldah's prophecy that Josiah would die "in peace" (בשלום) by locating the death of Josiah in "the foundation of peace," Jerusalem (ירושלם), thus showing the whole prophecy fulfilled.[118] In light of the disastrous and humiliating fates suffered by Saul, Ahab, and Amaziah, the prophecy actually remains, even in its horrible irony, a blessing. To die in Jerusalem, and not in captivity or on the battlefield, is something honorable in the world of Chronicles. This auspicious end to the narrative suggests that Josiah's end is not so much a part of the paradigm of immediate reward and punishment; that is, that Josiah is punished for a refusal to listen to the words of Neco.[119] Rather, it is the inevitable telos of God's will. The cult has been established and now the authority of the kingdom is transfered to foreign powers.

Most of the kings who succeed Josiah are appointed by either Neco or Nebuchadnezzar and all are deposed and taken into exile by them (2 Chr 36:1-21); the Davidides are no longer legitimate rulers. Even the city and the temple they built is destroyed in accordance with Yahweh's judgment against the people of Israel (2 Chr 34:24-25, 36:18-19); and, the land is made to lie desolate for seventy years to fulfill Jeremiah's prophecy (2 Chr 36:21). After this, Cyrus, roused by the spirit of God and made ruler of "the kingdoms of the lands" by God, invites the people to return and build the temple anew (2 Chr 36:22-23); it is not a Davidide who

---

[118] Mitchell, "Ironic Death", 2-3. Mitchell also observes, "This use of irony is not unlike that used in fulfillment of prophecy in classical sources, [e.g.], in Herodotus' story of Croesus' invasion of Persia and his loss of his empire (Hist. 1.53, 71, 91)."

[119] Josiah stands as breakable straw in the wind, so to speak, against the inevitable consequences. He is not a villain nor has he even done anything particularly sinful except that he was determined not to cede to this inevitability without a fight. He is, in fact, the very embodiment of Israel: he fights with God (Gen 32:29; Hos 12:4), who is with Neco, and God, in the last analysis, honors the king's fight, as God also honored the eponymous ancestor, though not with a new name but by gathering him to his grave in peace. The Chr's sympathy for Josiah, expressed in this irony and in the eulogy, is clear; the Davidic dynasty was something worth the fight but, though Josiah used every human strategem, including disguising himself like Ahab, God's will is as inviolable as it is inscrutable.

inaugurates the new era but a great king of Persia.[120] It is, perhaps, too much to say that the Chr did not desire the return of the Davidides but there is no question that the successive removal and exile of Josiah's successors as well as Neco's and Cyrus's claim to divine authority undermines the legitimacy of the Davidides, at least in the interim. Perhaps, the Chr envisions that the Davidides will return, in time, once the second temple is complete; an ironical vision befitting the ironical death of Josiah. This, however, is mere speculation; the Chr, through Cyrus, only expresses hope in a return from exile, a second *aliyah*, and a second temple.

4.3 The Eulogy

But, before the story of Israel's exile can be told, let alone the hope for return expressed, the Chr must end the story of Josiah. The story of Josiah is completed with a burial notice (35:24), a eulogy to the slain king (35:25), and a summary that points readers to sources on the stories of Josiah that the Chr has left untold (35:26-27). Although the burial notice and summary are conventions carried over by the Chr from the KH and common to the reports of most kings, they should not be overlooked. Often, the Chr reveals much in the way that these conventions are particularized to reflect each king.

The burial notice in 2 Chr 35:24 that concludes the account of Josiah's death secures Josiah's status among the good kings in Chronicles. Solomon (2 Chr 9:31), Rehoboam (2 Chr 12:16), Abijah (2 Chr 13:23), Asa (2 Chr 16:13-14), Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 21:1), Amaziah (2 Chr 25:28), Uzziah (2 Chr 26:23), Jotham (2 Chr 27:9), and Hezekiah (2 Chr 32:33) all receive a

---

[120] Riley, *King and Cultus*, 154, observes: "That the rule of Cyrus signals the termination of the Davidic dynasty can be seen by the application to him of two of the same emphases which were once operative in the dynastic promise to David: that the king reigns only under Yahweh and that the task of temple-building is linked with divinely established kingship. In receiving the commission to build the Temple, Cyrus inherits the chief symbol of the legitimacy of the Davidic dynasty according to the common ideological language of the ancient Near East, and according to the Chronistic narrative of the monarchy."

burial notice presented without significant discrimination against them; these kings are honored in death to rest with their ancestors and assume a place in the City of David, explicitly or implicitly in the graves of their fathers. Interestingly, only for Uzziah, Hezekiah, and Josiah does the Chr explicitly aver that these kings were buried in the graves of their fathers; and, Uzziah only nominally so in order to ensure that the special provisions for him on account of his leprosy are not read as a significant discrimination.[121] Josiah's burial notice is also quite distinctive in that it is followed by a eulogy; the only other kings to receive a eulogy are David (1 Chr 29:28) and Hezekiah and then these are much briefer than the one accorded to Josiah.

In the Chr's eulogy, the grief paradigm in the Josiah narrative is consummated, which as already noted replaces the usual joy paradigm for good kings. The torn clothes and tears of the king (2 Chr 34:19, 27) are now answered by the people's display of grief for their slain king. The word "to mourn" (אבל) in 2 Chr 35:24 is used only one other time, in 1 Chr 7:22, and forms of "to lament" (קין) and "lamentations" (קינה), which appear in 2 Chr 34:25, are used only here in Chronicles; the latter is even used twice. Thus, the poignant irony of the Josiah narrative is that the only king who wept for his people is the only king for whom all Israel mourns; no other king is mourned in death. So immense is the grief that Jeremiah, the great prophet, laments for the king and all the singers in Israel, male and female, speak of Josiah in their lamentations to the Chr's day. It is, perhaps, irony upon irony that these lamentations should become also, in the

---

[121] The Chr does not explicitly mention that David was buried in the City of David and obviously as the progenitor of the dynasty, he is not said to have been laid with his ancestors (see 1 Chr 29:28). Of course, none of this counts negatively against David; rather it excludes him from the present list as a unique, yet equally venerable, case.

Uzziah's burial includes the note that he was buried with his ancestors, which is then qualified as "beside them in a field because of his skin-disease." The issue of impurity raised in this case is not, however, meant to diminish the quality of Uzziah's burial and therefore the Chr insists on the burial with the kings at the same time this is qualified.

Several other kings are buried in the City of David but the Chr explicitly mentions that they were not buried in the graves of their fathers (2 Chr 21:20, 22:9, 24:25, 28:27, 33:20). The exception is important insofar as it shows (a) that the normative case is that kings are buried in the graves of their fathers and thus for those kings of whom it is not explicitly stated it should be assumed (i.e. Solomon, Rehoboam, Abijah, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Amaziah, Jotham), and (b) that this discrimination in the burial notice is clearly a judgment against the king.

Chr's words, "a statute upon Israel" (לחק על ישראל) and written down too; in death, Josiah bequeaths to the cult one more legacy: the ordinance of mourning, of lamentations, of grief. It is, of course, a bequest that could only have resulted from a tragic and untimely death. The lament of Jeremiah and the laments of all the singers of Israel are an enduring remembrance to the king of torah and tears.

The summary of sources to the untold stories of Josiah is, like the burial notice and the eulogy, also quite distinctive. It consists of two parallel statements:

> ויתר דברי יאשיהו וחסדיו ככתוב בתורת יהוה
> "and the remainder of Josiah's deeds and his *hesed* are as written in the law of Yahweh"
>
> ודבריו הראשנים והאחרנים הנם כתובים על ספר מלכי ישראל ויהודה
> "and his deeds, the first and the last, behold they are written upon the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah"

While the last of these two statements is typically Chronistic, the first statement is unusual, rather enigmatic, and very suggestive.

In Chronicles, only Yahweh towards Israel and its leaders (1 Chr 16:34, 41, 17:13; 2 Chr 1:8, 5:13, 6:14, 7:6, 20:21), David towards Hanun (1 Chr 19:2) and towards Yahweh (2 Chr 6:42), Jehoiada towards Joash (2 Chr 24:22), Hezekiah towards Yahweh (2 Chr 32:32), and Josiah towards Yahweh perform *hesed*. *Hesed* is the primary term in the HB to denote covenant loyalty and, as such, when not used of human-human relationships, overwhelmingly functions to characterize Yahweh's attitude and actions towards Israel or its leaders. It is, therefore, an extraordinary statement to ascribe to humans in the context of covenant as the Chr does to David, Hezekiah, and Josiah; so much so that it occurs only once more—Nehemiah ascribes it to himself in Neh 13:14—in the HB. It certainly links David, Hezekiah, and Josiah together as common types of covenant loyalty in Chronicles and sets them apart from the other kings.

More unusual than this, which at least has three parallels in the text, is the syntactic relationship of the phrase "the remainder of Josiah's deeds" to "his *hesed* is as written in the law of Yahweh." The phrase "as written in the law of Yahweh" is used in the HB to indicate that "X"

action was performed as "X" action is prescribed in the Torah, referenced by various essentially synonymous terms, where "X" is a statute or commandment, festival, or cultic practice authorized, or so claimed, in the Torah. Most scholars assume that the referent, or "X," of the phrase "as written in the law of Yahweh" (ככתוב בתורת יהוה) is limited to "his *hesed*" (חסדיו) and consequently that this phrase is in apposition to the main clause that begins with "the remainder of Josiah's deeds" and continues in the next verse with "and his deeds."[122] The Chr's syntactic construction, however, is ambigious and so it is unclear what the Chr intends to communicate. It seems also possible to read "the remainder of Josiah's deeds" and "his *hesed*" as a dual referent of the ככתוב ("as written") phrase, in which case not only Josiah's *hesed* but also the remainder of his deeds are as written in the Torah. This would be an extraordinary and certainly unique statement! Yet, even if the limited reading is preferable, the Chr creates a positive relationship between Josiah's *hesed* and the Torah that remains unmatched in the evaluation of any other king in Chronicles. Whatever else it may suggest, at minimum the Chr confirms the intimate connection between Josiah and the Torah established by the finding of the book and its application to his reforms.

---

[122] See Japhet, *Chronicles*, 1058; Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 333 and the extensive treatment of Kevin L. Spawn, *"As It Is Written" and Other Citation Formulae in the Old Testament: Their Use, Development, Syntax, and Significance* (ed. Otto Kaiser; BZAW 311; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 82-84, 113-116, 250.

Chapter 5

The Power of the Text

Texts are unavoidably shaped by the communities in which and for whom they are written. The analysis in the past two chapters has already shown that Chronicles reflects the politico-cultural and religious reality of the Chr's community—the loss of independence, the experience of exile and restoration, and the emergence of Persian governance—and that the Chr attempts to resolve some problems of continuity and discontinuity with earlier texts, such as the Torah and Samuel-Kings, in the Josiah narrative. Historical impulses of the text, therefore, are not simply or even primarily an attempt by the Chr to show *wie es eigentlich gewesen* but rather constitute an ideological re-presentation of the community's historical traditions with the purpose of making them (intellectually and/or pragmatically) relevant to the community's present. A text such as this aims to inscribe its ideological re-presentation on its audience in order to persuade them to a certain worldview and actions that reflect that worldview; this is the power of the text.

5.1 The Audience

Naturally, the persuasive power and communicative intent of the text is dependent on the audience's access to the text and the readings and re-readings of the text for those audiences. Liverani, in a study of the "celebrative texts issued by the ancient kings," identifies three "spheres of audience and levels of mobilization" of these texts according to degrees of

accessibility.[123] These spheres, relevant also to biblical texts such as Chronicles, are the "inner audience," the "wider audience," and the "outer audience."[124]

In the case of Chronicles, the inner audience consists of the Chr's community and literate scribes in other Yahwistic communities that received this text. This audience has direct access to the text, can read it and study it, and are presumably the most aware of the issues it is primarily meant to address. This inner audience is the only group with authority over the text; it can reject, re-write, accept, and/or disseminate it. Given this authority, any education of this audience through the text must be consistent with established norms, or else be surreptitious, if the text is going to be accepted, studied, and disseminated.

The wider audience consists of the lay participants in the cult (mostly free, adult males in Yehud and possibly in some centers outside Yehud, which acknowledge the religious authority of the inner audience). This audience receives the text filtered by the inner audience, who read it to them and teach them from it (either through homilies or other means). It is this audience who is the primary target of the text's ideologies.

The outer audience consists of those who do not participate, either by choice or status, in the cult (women, slaves, foreigners, etc.). This outer audience receives the text, if at all, filtered by the wider audience, either as second-hand instruction or simple cultural diffusion. While communication with this outer audience takes places, it is unlikely that this audience is, in any significant way, purposefully addressed in the text.

---

[123] Mario Liverani, "The Deeds of Ancient Mesopotamian Kings," *CANE* 4:2353.

[124] See also Yigal Levin, "Who was the Chronicler's Audience? A Hint from his Genealogies," *JBL* 122, no. 2 (2003): 229-245. I essentially agree with Levin's conclusions about the audience of Chronicles and have here used Liverani to systematize and categorize those conclusions in a way that I think is actually consistent with, though not explicitly articulated by Levin. Also, my analysis of the audience(s) is ultimately more comprehensive, by virtue of the outer audience(s), than Levin's (if not as thoroughly defended).

5.2 The Message(s)

The analysis in the previous chapters "confirms the proposal that Jerusalem, the temple, the cult, and the absolute sovereignty of Yahweh are central elements of the Chr's ideology."[125] As seen, the structures and themes of the narrative, however they are construed or read, are all concerned to strengthen the centrality of these elements.

In particular though, there is sustained interest in the cult in the Josiah narrative. Through the narrative, the Chr strengthens notions communicated in earlier narratives and introduces additional notions about the cult and proper cultic practices. In the Josiah narrative and throughout the book, the Chr stresses fidelity and condemns idolatry (2 Chr 34:2-33); emphasizes the importance of temple upkeep (2 Chr 34:8-13); places the book of the law and the covenant at the center of cultic life (2 Chr 34:14-33); supports the centralization of the cult in the Jerusalem temple (2 Chr 34:2–35:19); and, encourages intermediary roles for the Levites in cultic festivals (2 Chr 35:1-19). Specific to the Josiah narrative, the Chr advances a particular perspective on the cooking of the paschal sacrifices (2 Chr 35:13) and the performance of the Passover (2 Chr 35:1-19) and ordains mourning as a cultic rite (2 Chr 35:24-25).

Yet, while these aspects of the narrative are undoubtedly didactic and kerygmatic,[126] the assumption that the Chr's accounts of positive aspects in monarchic history from David to Josiah are prescriptive can be problematic insofar as it (a) generally identifies only ultimate events of the narrative as prescriptive and denies such status to penultimate events and (b) fails to consider other possible and legitimate readings of the narrative. In the case of Josiah's Passover,

---

[125] I reached this same conclusion in Kenneth A. Ristau, "Breaking Down Unity: An Analysis of 1 Chronicles 21" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, Winnipeg, Man, May 30 2004), 19.

[126] For more on the didactic and kerygmatic quality of Chronicles, see esp. Leslie C. Allen, "Kerymatic Units in 1 & Chronicles," *JSOT* 41 (1988): 21-36; Rex Mason, *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile: Based on the "addresses" in Chronicles, the "speeches" in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the Post-Exilic Prophetic Books* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

for example, it is generally assumed that it is prescriptive *over and against* the Passover in Hezekiah's reign.[127] This conclusion seems unwarranted.

Instead, the Chr appears to use the history of Israel as an illustrative guide to contingent planning. In other words, the Chr uses distinctive portraits of each Judean king to demonstrate flexibility in preserving proper cultic worship as Yahweh's people encounter historical contingency. Thus, to continue the example, the Passover in Hezekiah's reign is not simply an imperfect Passover festival subsequently perfected by Josiah, but rather the former functions as a case study in maintaining proper worship amidst trying and difficult circumstances while the latter presents an ideal Passover in affluent times.

Furthermore, it seems likely that the Passover of Josiah's reign may have had less direct relevance for practice in a struggling cultic community in Yehud than the narrative of the Passover in Hezekiah's reign. The Josiah Passover likely had an eschatological flavor to the Chr's primary community given its extravagant provisions (2 Chr 35:7-9), the outstanding performance of the Levites necessitated by the sheer magnitude of the celebration (2 Chr 35:3-6, 10-15), and its elevated theological evaluation (2 Chr 35:18). Its prescriptive power, while undoubtedly not lost on the primary community, would nevertheless have been muted by the otherworldliness of the Chr's description and, as such, it is doubtful that it reflects an entirely realistic expectation for the Passover in the Chr's own time.

The power and communicative intent of the Chr's narrative therefore is not always signaled by the glorification of the events in the narrated world nor is there always an attempt to normalize glorified events among the community of readers. Rather the power and communicative intent lies in the variability of the text; it lies in the ideological tone that is struck by the contingent and yet also transcendent interpretation of the cult that the Chr forwards

---

[127] See, e.g., Ben Zvi, "'Boiling in Fire'", 1-14; Japhet, *Chronicles*, 1041, 1044-1055; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 363-364.

throughout the book. Israel and the cult, according to the Chr, are living entities that exist in relationship with Yahweh: immutable in their existence but adaptable in their application.[128] To be sure, the Chr has many very particular views on the nature of the relationship and proper adherence to the law but, at the core, the Chr argues that it is the relationship with Yahweh that must always occupy the center of Israel and its cult.

This point is exemplified in the Josiah narrative. Josiah is the epigone of strict adherence to the law and yet in the end this strict adherence is not a guarantee of blessing. Quite the contrary actually, there is a surety of judgment against the people, who will go into exile, and Josiah himself dies at the hands of a foreign king who displays greater acumen concerning God's will. This irony cuts deeply and stresses the utter futility of attempting to control Yahweh through cultic practices. The Chr appears to echo the age-old cry of the prophet: the means (law) is not (a substitute for) the end (a relationship with Yahweh).[129] Still, the means are important for the Chr, as clearly evident by the emphasis on liturgy and cultic administration throughout the Josiah narrative and the book. Both the Josiah narrative and the book as a whole repeatedly call to attention the law and the proper execution of the cult for the community as the means to a proper relationship with Yahweh. This point is often made through the immediate reward and punishment paradigm, which inculcates the importance of fidelity and warns against infidelity.[130]

---

[128] Although this point is made throughout Chronicles, it is most cogently expressed through the genealogies; in some sense, the narrative is the application of the general principles established in the genealogies. In the genealogies, the Chr communicates Israel's place among the nations, reveals its makeup and character, lists its kings, gives evidence of its vitality through the generations, delineates its geographical boundaries and establishes the importance of Jerusalem as the trans-tribal capital, and places the cult, by way of the Levitical genealogies, at the center of Israel. See esp. Gary N. Knoppers, "Excursus: The Genealogies" in *1 Chronicles* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2004), 245-265; Knoppers, "Intermarriage," 15-30; Levin, "Understanding Biblical Genealogies," 11-46; "The Chronicler's Audience," 229-245; Robert R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* (YNER 7; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977); "Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research," *JBL* 94 (1975): 169-189.

[129] See, e.g., Samuel's rejection of Saul in 1 Sam 15:22-23 or passages such as Isa 1:11-17, 66:2; Jer 7:22-23; Hos 6:6; Amos 5:21-24; Mic 6:6-8.

[130] See Dillard, "Reign of Asa," 207-218; "Reward and Punishment," 164-172; Japhet, *Ideology*, 165-176; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, passim.

In the Josiah narrative though, readers encounter a significant obstacle to this paradigm, for whereas the Chr in 1 Chr 10 to 2 Chr 32 is largely consistent to show that proper performance of the means brings joy and blessings from Yahweh, the Josiah narrative not only fails to explicitly forward this ideal but it appears to directly contradict it; as just mentioned, Josiah's (nearly) ideal kingship and reforms lead only to the spectre of exile and the king's own death by Egyptian archers. Although it is possible that this inconsistency is the result of redactional layers, this solution, aside from falling outside the purview of my final form analysis, negates one of the most ignored yet poignant and important themes of Chronicles and the Josiah narrative in particular, namely the encouragement to faithfulness in the face of the inscrutability and/or judgment of Yahweh.

Indeed, for a post-exilic cultic community in the small province of Yehud not nearly the size of even the Chr's Judah (let alone the Chr's Israel), the immediate reward of divine blessings for faithfulness that so many scholars have identified as the hallmark of Chronicles is a strange ideology to advance. Such a message would only serve to condemn the community as somehow inadequate for it was too small, too beset by difficulties, too confined in its influence, too poor and powerless to claim that it was a faithful community in the tradition of David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah—all kings who, blessed by Yahweh, reigned over a glorious people in a promised land and established an authentic cult. Chronicles could not be then the great apologia for the post-exilic Jerusalem temple and its personnel that its content and many commentators suggest. Its message would simply ring hollow with those in the post-exilic community and actually serve as a polemic against the post-exilic Jerusalem temple and its personnel. Now, perhaps this is at least part of its message: the post-exilic cult is failing because the traditions of David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah have not been effectively implemented. But, the text is not so negative; it clearly is an apologia for the centrality of Jerusalem and the temple cult.

Consequently it seems appropriate to conclude that the Josiah narrative is evidence of the Chr's much more complex system of cause and effect than just the immediate reward and

punishment paradigm articulated by scholars; a system that proves more consistent with the situation of the post-exilic community. Although it is true that the Chr often develops a correspondence between individual actions and rewards or punishments from Yahweh, there are many times in the text that this correspondence does not hold or, at least, the severity of the punishment appears inconsistent with the offense.[131] To this extent, the Chr presents a world in which Yahweh's judgments are often inexplicable, at least certainly from the perspective of the immediate reward and punishment paradigm. In the Josiah narrative, this counter-current is clearly evident, especially in the poignant ironies of the narrative explored in the last chapter of this thesis. Does the finding of the book of the law bring blessing to the community in the narrative world or signal its inexorable demise? Is Josiah's death an expression of blessing upon him or a curse? Causes and consequences that lead to and flow from these events contradict a clear correlation of individual actions with rewards and punishments.

The finding of the book of the law is, at least in part, a blessing for Josiah and the community; Josiah's programme of reforms leads directly to the finding of the book, the book itself is a holy book, and it provides the basis for covenant renewal and a glorious Passover. Yet, the book also heralds the exile of the people; a judgment subsequently confirmed in Huldah's prophecy. This double surety of judgment is inconsistent with Josiah's superlative reforms, which precede and proceed from this account, and the participation of the people in them, even if Huldah's prophecy promises relief for the king. It, therefore, contradicts the immediate reward and punishment paradigm. To this extent, it is apparent that the Josiah narrative spells out a complexity of causes and effects that are not entirely predictable but to which only one response is admissible, that is faithfulness.

---

[131] See Ben Zvi, "Sense of Proportion," 37-51.

In a different way, Josiah's inability to discern Yahweh's will in the confrontation with Neco, which brings about his death, similarly challenges the immediate reward and punishment paradigm. While the Chr appears to reinstate the correspondence of individual actions with rewards and punishments in this account, there is an undeniable disconnect between the accomplishments of the king, Huldah's prophecy, and his untimely death. Furthermore, the people receive in Josiah's death the cultic ordinance of a lament. This ordinance consummates the cult in the monarchic period—clearly a blessing. Indeed, the lament itself is one genre in biblical literature that explicitly permits the people to challenge any injustice that befalls them. The lament would not be necessary in a world of the perfect correspondence of individual actions with rewards and punishments that some attribute to Chronicles; in such a world, there is nothing to lament because every event is the just consequence of a specific cause.

Because of the relationship of this theme to other parts of the book, it is unlikely that the Josiah narrative is a redactional anomaly but rather it is an integral part, even climax, of the relevancy and affirmative message of Chronicles to the post-exilic community. While the immediate reward and punishment paradigm provides encouragement that faithfulness is rewarded and evil punished, the Chr argues that inexplicable judgment and disaster from Yahweh can befall the faithful and the proper response is continued faithfulness. This message, while seemingly negative insofar as it suggests a capricious and untrustworthy god, is actually a positive one because the cultic insider is unlikely to accept that Yahweh is capricious and untrustworthy and therefore will assign the misfortune to some inscrutable good while perceiving from the text that such misfortune is not necessarily an indictment or an indication of their unfaithfulness. It also encourages faithfulness in the face of judgment because through such faithfulness a legacy is created for subsequent generations, just as Josiah provided for the Chr's own generation.

This, in turn, confirms the proposal that the kings of Judah in Chronicles are instrumentalized rather than idealized; they are—and this is admittedly a fine line—examples

rather than models.[132] The king succeeds as a divinely-ordained patron of the temple and its institutions.[133] He is invested with the power to build the temple, to maintain the defense of the city and its environs, the authority to interpret and apply the liturgical texts, and the responsibility to enforce and maintain the covenant (and purge idolatry) between Yahweh, king, and people. Now, this may seem an unassailable position of authority yet it is not. The king in Chronicles, as a patron of the temple and its institutions, is its servant. The king must adhere to the Torah; his authority to interpret and apply the liturgical texts is limited by the tradition itself and by prophetic words; and, he is accountable to Yahweh at all times and in all respects. No ruler in Chronicles other than Solomon, and possibly Abijah, perfectly succeeds in their mandate and consequently there is no concerted attempt to idealize the kingship. In fact, the kingship is repeatedly presented as imperfect and the king repeatedly subject to the judgment of Yahweh revealed in the Torah. Thus, the Chr appears to advocate a political system that is only pragmatically monarchic and essentially theocratic.[134]

The Josiah narrative also explains the absence of a Davidic ruler in the Chr's own time and presents a world in which foreign kings can have rightful dominion over Judah/Yehud. However, by the Israelization of these foreign kings, a phenomenon discussed in the last chapter, the Chr shapes, communicates, and/or reinforces for the community of the text an ideological construction of foreign kings as dependent on Yahweh for their authority and as ones, who in relation to Israel, Jerusalem, and the temple, are not ideologically at the center of the community's life. Rather, Josiah must go out from Jerusalem to meet Neco and Neco as well as the other foreign kings in Chronicles are only successful when they speak in the language of the

---

[132] For this distinction, I am indebted to Jonker, *Reflections*, 33, who makes it with respect to the Chr's presentation of Josiah.

[133] On this point, see esp. Riley, *King and Cultus*.

[134] See Jonathan E. Dyck, *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chronicler* (BibIntS 33; Leiden: Brill, 1998), and cf. Antje Labahn, "Antitheocratic Tendencies in Chronicles" in *Yahwism after the Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Era* (ed. Rainer Albertz and Bob Becking; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003), 115-135.

Israelite religion.[135] The imperial throne, therefore, is subordinate to the center that the Chr identifies with the presence, knowledge, and law of Yahweh as mediated through the temple and its functionaries.

For the inner audience then, the Josiah narrative primarily reinforces accepted ideologies (with variations present only on a sub-thematic level), identifies the type of rulers they ought to serve (or oppose), negotiates, even argues, some differences over liturgy and cultic administration, and, to the extent that they are themselves rulers, illustrates the conduct that will meet with success and the conduct that will result in failure.

For the wider audience (and by extension the outer audience), the message is that adherence to the cult (and its leaders) as a means to a relationship with Yahweh is the highest pursuit for the true Yahwist, not loyalty to a divinely-ordained kingship. No king, Davidic or foreign, is greater than the temple let alone Yahweh's equal. In this sense, the Chr seems to reject messianism as the core constituent of true Yahwism; the Messiah is, at most, an eschatological ideal and even then a servant to the temple. True Yahwism in Chronicles is expressed through the temple, its liturgy, and fidelity to Yahweh above all else and it is to this that the wider audience is called.

5.3 Conclusion

The sophisticated structure and the multiple themes and motifs of the Josiah narrative point to a flexible interaction with the traditions that, in turn, expands the potential readings and re-readings in a process perhaps most akin to the homiletical traditions of contemporary Jewish

---

[135] In this respect, Sennacherib is the foremost example of the negative (2 Chr 32:1-23). Regardless of Sennacherib's overwhelming power, his contempt for Yahweh ensures that his attempt to conquer the center of Israel's community life—Jerusalem and the temple—is thwarted.

and Christian communities.[136] This didactic and kerygmatic quality of the text is the essence of its power and endurance. Through reading and re-reading the Josiah narrative in Chronicles, and reading it to others, the community of the text advances and promotes its own ideals and values and receives encouragement in its present situation and future goals. By reading and re-reading the Josiah narrative in Chronicles ourselves, it is possible to identify these aspects of the text and also at the same time identify some of the fears, anxieties, and insecurities of the community that the text attempts to overcome.

From the Josiah narrative, in particular, it is clear that the Chr and the primary community of the text are passionate Yahwists concerned with monotheistic worship centred in Jerusalem and its temple. They are interested in questions about leadership and temple organization and deeply concerned with the intersection of praxis and ideology in the cult and the life of the community. They are a community often rapt by their insecurity and dependence on foreign powers, as expressed through the subtext of exile and judgment. Yet, despite these insecurities, they remain committed to a theological tradition, which they understand in continuity with the past communities that wrote and disseminated the Torah and also, though perhaps less deferentially, Samuel-Kings and other books of the HB. This continuity provides the community with its self-identity, its sense of purpose in the world, its source of joy, and also, as evident from the Josiah narrative, its validation of lament. In a world of tragedy, perhaps the last of these is one of the most important legacies of the Josiah narrative.

---

[136] On the relationship between re-reading and homiletics, see Patrick J. Willson and Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "Preaching as the Re-Reading of Scripture," *Int* 52, no. 4 (1998): 392-404. On the preaching of Chronicles, see esp. Allen, "Kerymatic Units," 21-36; Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*.

Bibliography

Adam, A. K. M. *What is Postmodern Biblical Criticism?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Alfrink, Bern. "Die Gadd'sche Chronik und die Heilige Schrift." *Biblica* 8 (1927): 385-417.

———. "Die Schlacht bei Megiddo und der Tod des Josias." *Biblica* 15 (1934): 173-184.

Allen, Leslie C. "Further Thoughts on an Old Recension of Reigns in Paralipomena." *Harvard Theological Review* 61 (1968): 483–491.

———. *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Masoretic Text.* 2 vols. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 25, 27. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.

———. "Kerymatic Units in 1 & Chronicles." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 41 (1988): 21-36.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative.* New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Augustin, Matthias. "The Literary Form of the 'Constructed War Chronicle with Theological Interpretation' in the Books of Chronicles." Pages 133-140 in *Proceedings of the 9th World Congress of Jewish Studies.* Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988.

Auld, A. Graeme. "Prophets Shared--But Recycled." Pages 19-28 in *Future of the Deuteronomistic History.* Louvain: Peeters, 2000.

Avi-Yonah, Michael. *The Holy Land: From the Persian to the Arab Conquests (536 B.C. to A.D. 640): A Historical Geography.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966.

Bar-Efrat, Shimon. *Narrative Art in the Bible.* Edited by David Clines, Philip R. Davies, David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell. Translated by Shimon Bar-Efrat and Dorothea Shefer-Vanson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 70 (Bible and Literature Series 17). Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989. Repr., 1992.

Barrick, W. Boyd. "Dynastic Politics, Priestly Succession, and Josiah's Eighth Year." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112, no. 4 (2000): 564-582.

———. *The King and the Cemeteries: Toward a New Understanding of Josiah's Reform.* Edited by The Board of the Quarterly. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 88. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Begg, Christopher T. "The Death of Josiah in Chronicles: Another View." *Vetus Testamentum* 37, no. 1 (1987): 1-8.

———. "The Death of Josiah: Josephus and the Bible." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 64, no. 1 (1988): 157-163.

———. "'Seeking Yahweh' and the Purpose of Chronicles." *Louvain Studies* 9 (1982): 128-141.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "About Time: Observations about the Construction of Time in the Book of Chronicles." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 22 (2000): 17-31.

———. "The Authority of 1-2 Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 3 (1988): 59-88.

———. "The Book of Chronicles: Another Look." *The Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies* 62 (2002/2003): 5-26.

———. "A Gateway to the Chronicler's Teaching: The Account of the Reign of Ahaz in 2 Chr 28,1-27." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 7, no. 2 (1993): 216-248.

———. *Micah*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 21B. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

———. "Revisiting 'Boiling in Fire' in 2 Chr 35:13." Paper presented at the Sixteenth Annual Midwest Jewish Studies Colloquium, Case Western Reserve University, The Samuel Rosenthal Jewish Studies Center, Cleveland, May 2004.

———. "The Secession of the Northern Kingdom in Chronicles: Accepted 'Facts' and New Meanings." Pages 61-88 in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*. Edited by Matt Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie and Gary N. Knoppers. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 371. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.

———. "A Sense of Proportion: An Aspect of the Theology of the Chronicler." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 9, no. 1 (1995): 37-51.

———. *Signs of Jonah: Reading and Rereading in Ancient Yehud*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 367. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

———. "When the Foreign Monarch Speaks." Pages 209-228 in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*. Edited by Matt Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

———. "When YHWH Tests People: General Considerations and Particular Observations Regarding the Books of Chronicles and Job." Edited by Duncan Burns and John Rogerson. forthcoming.

Berlin, Adele. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. First Midland Book ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.

Berquist, Jon L. *Judaism in Persia's Shadow: A Social and Historical Approach*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Betlyon, John W. "The Provincial Government of Persian Period Judea and the Yehud Coins." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986): 633-642.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Temple and Society in Achaemenid Judah." Pages 22-53 in *Second Temple Studies 1: Persian Period*. Edited by Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 117. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Boehmer, J. "König Josias Tod." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 30 (1933): 199-203.

Bottéro, Jean. "The Substitute King and His Fate." Pages 138-155 in *Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Breslauer, S. Daniel. "Scripture and Authority: Two Views of the Josianic Reformation." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 10 (1983): 135-143.

Brettler, Marc Zvi. *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

———. "Cyclical and Teleological Time in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 111-128 in *Time and Temporality in the Ancient World*. Edited by Ralph M. Rosen. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2004.

Buhl, F. "Eine arabische Parallele zu 2 Chr. 35:25." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 29 (1909): 314.

Cannon, W. W. "A Note on Dr. Welch's Article 'The Death of Josiah'." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 44 (1926): 63-64.

Carter, Charles E. *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study*. Edited by David Clines and Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 294. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Cogan, Mordechai. "The Chronicler's Use of Chronology as Illuminated by Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions." Pages 197–210 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Jeffrey H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

Coggins, Richard. "On Kings and Disguises." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 50 (1991): 55-62.

Cooper, Peter. "What was Josiah Thinking?" *Bible Review* 16, no. 3 (2000): 28-29.

Couroyer, B. "Le litige entre Josias et Néchao (II Chron. 35:20 ff.)." *Revue Biblique* 55 (1948): 388-396.

Cross, Frank M., and David N. Freedman. "Josiah's Revolt against Assyria." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12, no. 1 (1953): 56-58.

Curtis, Edward L., and Albert A. Madsen. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976.

Day, Edward. "The Promulgation of Deuteronomy." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 21 (1902): 197-213.

De Vries, Simon J. *1 and 2 Chronicles*. Forms of the Old Testament Literature 11. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

———. "Festival Ideology in Chronicles." Pages 104-124 in *Problems in Biblical Theology.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

———. "Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107, no. 4 (1988): 619-639.

Dillard, Raymond B. *2 Chronicles.* Word Biblical Commentary 15. Waco: Word Books, 1987.

———. "The Reign of Asa (2 Chronicles 14-16): An Example of the Chronicler's Theological Method." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23 (1980): 207-218.

———. "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retribution." *Westminster Theological Journal* 46, no. 1 (1984): 164-172.

Dion, Paul E. *Hebrew Poetics.* 2nd ed. Mississauga: Benben Publications, 1992.

Dyck, Jonathan E. *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chronicler.* Biblical interpretation Series 33. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Eslinger, Lyle. "Josiah and the Torah Book: Comparison of 2 Kgs 22:1-23:28 and 2 Chr 34:1-35:19." *Hebrew Annual Review* 10 (1986): 37-62.

Fishbane, Michael A. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985. Repr., 1989.

Glatt-Gilad, David A. "The Role of Huldah's Prophecy in the Chronicler's Portrayal of Josiah's Reform." *Biblica* 77, no. 1 (1996): 16-31.

Goedegebuure, Petra M. "KBo 17.17+: Remarks on an Old Hittite Royal Substitution Ritual." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 2, no. 1 (2002): 61-73.

Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian.* 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Habel, Norman C. *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament.* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Halpern, Baruch. "Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure-Indications of an Earlier Source." Pages 35–56 in *The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text.* Edited by Richard E. Friedman. Near Eastern Studies 22. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

———. "Why Manasseh is Blamed for the Babylonian Exile: The Evolution of a Biblical Tradition." *Vetus Testamentum* 48, no. 4 (1998): 473-514.

Handy, Lowell K. "Josiah after the Chronicler." Pages 95-103 in *Proceedings: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies 14.* Cincinnati: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies, 1994.

———. "The Role of Huldah in Josiah's Cult Reform." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 106, no. 1 (1994): 40-53.

Haran, Menahem. "The Disappearance of the Ark." *Israel Exploration Journal* 13, no. 1 (1963): 46-58.

Hauge, Martin R. "On the Sacred Spot: The Concept of the Proper Localization Before God." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 1 (1990): 30-60.

Hens-Piazza, Gina. *The New Historicism.* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Hoglund, Kenneth G. "The Achaemenid Context." Pages 54-72 in *Second Temple Studies 1: Persian Period.* Edited by Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 117. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Immerwahr, Henry R. *Form and Thought in Herodotus.* Edited by Walton Morris. Philogical Monographs, XXIII. Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1966.

Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary.* Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.

———. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought.* 2nd rev. ed. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum 9. New York: P. Lang, 1997.

———. "Interchanges of Verbal Roots in Parallel Texts in Chronicles." *Hebrew Studies* 28 (1987): 9-50.

Johnstone, William. *1 and 2 Chronicles.* 2 vols. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 253–254. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

———. "Reactivating the Chronicles Analogy in Pentateuchal Studies, with Special Reference to the Sinai Pericope in Exodus." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (1987): 16-37.

Jonker, Louis. "The Pragmatic-Rhetorical Function of Temporal Organization in Old Testament Narratives: The Case of the Chronicler's Portrayal of King Josiah." Paper presented at the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Cambridge, UK, July 2003.

———. *Reflections of King Josiah in Chronicles: Late Stages of the Josiah Reception in 2 Chr 34f.* Edited by Christof Hardmeier. Textpragmatische Studien zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte der Hebräischen Bibel 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2003.

Joüon, Paul. "Notes philologiques sur le texte hébreu de 1 et 2 Chroniques (1 Chr. 12:18; 2 Chr 17:17; 22:7; 23:9; 34:6; 34:33)." *Biblica* 13 (1932): 87-90.

Kalimi, Isaac. "Literary-Chronological Proximity in the Chronicler's Historiography." *Vetus Testamentum* 43, no. 3 (1993): 318-338.

Kellermann, U. "Anmerkungen zum Verständis der Tora in den chronistischen Schriften." *Biblische Notizen* 42 (1988): 49-92.

Keulen, P. S. F. van. "The Meaning of the Phrase wn'spt 'l-qbrtyk bslwm in 2 Kings XXII 20." *Vetus Testamentum* 46, no. 2 (1996): 256-260.

Knoppers, Gary N. "Excursus: The Genealogies." Pages 245-265 in *I Chronicles*. Vol. 1 of The Anchor Bible 12. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2004.

———. "Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118, no. 1 (1999): 49-72.

———. "Intermarriage, Social Complexity, and Ethnic Diversity in the Genealogy of Judah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120, no. 1 (2001): 15-30.

Kutsch, E. "ברית." Pages 256-266 in vol. 1 of *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.

Laato, Antti. *Josiah and David Redivivus: The Historical Josiah and the Messianic Expectations of Exilic and Postexilic Times*. Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series 33. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992.

———. "The Levitical Genealogies in 1 Chronicles 5-6 and the Formation of Levitical Ideology in Post-Exilic Judah." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 62 (1994): 77-99.

Labahn, Antje. "Antitheocratic Tendencies in Chronicles." Pages 115-135 in *Yahwism after the Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Era*. Edited by Rainer Albertz and Bob Becking. Studies in Theology and Religion 5. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003.

Labat, René. "Le Sort des Substituts Royaux en Assyrie au Temps des Sargonides." *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 40 (1945-46): 123-142.

Levin, Yigal. "Understanding Biblical Genealogies." *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 9 (2001): 11-46.

———. "Who was the Chronicler's Audience? A Hint from his Genealogies." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122, no. 2 (2003): 229-245.

Lipschits, Oded. "Demographic Changes in Judah between the 7th and the 5th Centuries BCE." Pages 323-376 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Edited by Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Liverani, Mario. "The Deeds of Ancient Mesopotamian Kings." Pages 2353-2366 in vol. 4 of *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Jack M. Sasson. 4 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000.

———. "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts." *Orientalia* 42, no. 1-2 (1973): 178-194.

Long, Burke O. "Framing Repetitions in Biblical Historiography." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106, no. 3 (1987): 385-399.

Longacre, Robert. *An Anatomy of Speech Notions*. Lisse: The Peter De Ridder Press, 1976.

Lundbom, Jack R. "The Inclusio and other Framing Devices in Deuteronomy I-XXVIII." *Vetus Testamentum* 46, no. 3 (1996): 296-315.

———. "The Lawbook of the Josianic Reform." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38, no. 3 (1976): 293-302.

Mason, Rex. *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile: Based on the "addresses" in Chronicles, the "speeches" in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the Post-Exilic Prophetic Books.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

McCarthy, Dennis J. "Covenant and Law in Chronicles-Nehemiah." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44, no. 1 (1982): 25-44.

McKenzie, Steven L. *1-2 Chronicles.* Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004.

McKenzie, Steven L., and Stephen R. Haynes. *To Each its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and their Application.* Rev ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.

Mitchell, Christine. "The Ironic Death of Josiah in 2 Chronicles." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, November 2003.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. "Time in Ancient Historiography." Pages 179-204 in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography.* Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1977.

Mosis, Rudolf. *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes.* Freiburger Theologische Studien 92. Freiburg: Herder, 1973.

Muffs, Yochanan. "Love and Joy as Metaphors of Volition in Hebrew and Related Literatures, Part 2: The Joy of Giving." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 11 (1979): 91-111.

Myers, Jacob M. *II Chronicles: Introduction, Translation, and Notes.* The Anchor Bible 13. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965.

Nel, Henrietta W. "Theopolitics in the Davidic Monarchical System: A Pilot Study." *In Die Skriflig* 31, no. 4 (1997): 421-434.

Noth, Martin. *The Chronicler's History.* Translated by H. G. M. Williamson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 50. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

Parpola, Simo. *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal.* 2 vols. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 5/1, 5/2. Kevelaer: Butzon and Bercker, 1970.

———. *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal.* Kevelaer: Butzon and Bercker, 1970.

Parunak, H. Van Dyke. "Oral Typesetting: Some Uses of Biblical Structure." *Biblica* 62 (1981): 153-168.

———. "Transitional Techniques in the Bible." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102, no. 4 (1983): 525-548.

Polzin, Robert. *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 12. Missoula, 1976.

Powell, Mark A. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Priest, John. "Huldah's Oracle." *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1980): 366-368.

Quick, Philip A. "Resumptive Repetition: A Two-Edged Sword." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 6 (1993): 289-316.

———. "Taxonomy of Repetition." *Notes on Translation* 114 (1986): 15-26.

Riffaterre, Michael. *Fictional Truth.* Edited by Stephen G. Nichols, Gerald Prince and Wendy Steiner. Parallax Re-Visions of Culture and Society. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Riley, William. *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History.* Edited by David Clines and Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 160. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

———. "Situating Biblical Narrative: Poetics and the Transmission of Community Values." *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 9 (1985): 38-52.

Ristau, Kenneth A. "Breaking Down Unity: An Analysis of 1 Chronicles 21." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, Winnipeg, Man, May 30 2004.

Römer, Thomas C. "Historiographie et identité: Rôles et fonctions de "l'historiographie deutéronomiste" *Foi et Vie* 96 (1997): 3-18.

———. "Le livre de Josué: Histoire d'une propagande Propagande d'une histoire." *Foi et Vie* 97 (1998): 5-20.

———. "Transformations in Deuteronomistic Biblical Historiography: On 'Book-Finding' and other Literary Strategies." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 109, no. 1 (1997): 1-11.

Rosenbaum, Jonathan. "Hezekiah's Reform and the Deuteronomistic Tradition." *Harvard Theological Review* 72 (1979): 23-43.

Rost, Leonhard. "Josias Passa." Pages 169-175 in *Theologie in Geschichte und Kunst.* Witten: Luther Verlag, 1968.

Rowton, Michael B. "Jeremiah and the Death of Josiah." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 10 (1951): 128–130.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Chronikbücher.* Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955.

Schaefer, Glenn E. "The Significance of Seeking God in the Purpose of the Chronicler." Th.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1972.

Schaper, Joachim. "The Jerusalem Temple as an Instrument of the Achaemenid Fiscal Administration." *Vetus Testamentum* 45 (1995): 528-539.

Schökel, Luis Alonso. *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*. Subsidia biblica 11. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988.

Segal, Judah B. *The Hebrew Passover From the Earliest Times to A.D. 70*. London Oriental Series 12. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Shaver, Judson R. *Torah and the Chronicler's History Work: An Inquiry into the Chronicler's References to Laws, Festivals and Cultic Institutions in Relation to Pentateuchal Legislation*. Brown Judaic Studies 196. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Ska, Jean Louis. *"Our Fathers Have Told Us": Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives*. Subsidia biblica 13. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990.

Smith, Daniel L. "The Politics of Ezra: Sociological Indicators of Postexilic Judaean Society." Pages 73-97 in *Second Temple Studies 1: The Persian Period*. Edited by Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 117. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Smyth, Françoise. "When Josiah Has Done His Work or the King is Properly Buried: A Synchronic Reading of 2 Kings 22.1-23.28." Pages 343-358 in *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 30. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Snyman, Gerrie. "'Tis a Vice to Know Him.' Readers' Response-Ability and Responsibility in 2 Chronicles 14-16." *Semeia* 77, no. 1 (1997): 91-113.

Solomon, Anne M. "The Structure of the Chronicler's History: A Key to the Organization of the Pentateuch." *Semeia* 46 (1989): 51-64.

Spawn, Kevin L. *"As It Is Written" and Other Citation Formulae in the Old Testament: Their Use, Development, Syntax, and Significance*. Edited by Otto Kaiser. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 311. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.

Speyer, Wolfgang. *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike: Mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit*. Hypomnemata: Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

Stern, Sacha. *Time and Process in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2003.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Edited by Herbert Marks and Robert Polzin. Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Sweeney, Marvin A. *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Tadmor, Hayim. "Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 15, no. 4 (1956): 226-230.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Presentation of Synchroneity and Simultaneity in Biblical Narratives." Pages 9-26 in *Studies in Hebrew Narrative Art throughout the Ages*. Edited by Joseph Heinemann and Shmuel Werses. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1978.

Talshir, Zipora. "The Three Deaths of Josiah and the Strata of Biblical Historiography (2 Kings xxiii 29-30, 2 Chronicles xxxv 20-25, 1 Esdras i 23-31)." *Vetus Testamentum* 46, no. 2 (1996): 213-236.

Terblanche, M. D. "No Need for a Prophet like Jeremiah: The Absence of the Prophet Jeremiah in Kings." Pages 306-314 in *Past, Present, Future*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Throntveit, Mark A. "The Relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon in the Books of Chronicles." Pages 105-121 in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*. Edited by Matt Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie and Gary N. Knoppers. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 371. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.

———. *When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles*. Edited by J. J. M. Roberts and Charles Talbert. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 93. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1987.

Todd, E. "The Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 9 (1956): 288–293.

Trible, Phyllis. *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Trotter, James M. "Was the Second Jerusalem Temple a Primarily Persian Project?" *Scandanavian Journal of the Old Testament* 15 (2001): 276-294.

Van Rooy, Harry V. "Prophet and Society in the Persian Period According to Chronicles." Pages 163-179 in *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple and Community in the Persian Period*. Edited by Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent H. Richards. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 175. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Van Seters, John. "Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible." *Studies in Religion / Sciences Religieuses* 29, no. 4 (2000): 395-409.

Wahl, T. P. "Chronicles: The Rewriting of History." *The Bible Today* 26 (1988): 197-202.

Waltke, Bruce, and Michael O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Washburn, David L. "Perspective and Purpose: Understanding the Josiah Story." *Trinity Journal* 12, no. 1 (1991): 59-78.

Welch, Adam C. "Death of Josiah." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43 (1925): 255-260.

———. *The Work of the Chronicler: Its Purpose and Its Date*. Schweich Lectures 1938. London: Published for the British Academy by H. Milford Oxford University Press, 1939.

Welten, Peter. *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern.* Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.

Williamson, H. G. M. *1 and 2 Chronicles.* New Century Bible. Grand Rapids and London: Eerdmans and Marshall Morgan & Scott Publishing, 1982.

———. "The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History." *Vetus Testamentum* 32, no. 2 (1982): 242-248.

———. *Israel in the Books of Chronicles.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

———. "Reliving the Death of Josiah: A Reply to C. T. Begg." *Vetus Testamentum* 37, no. 1 (1987): 9-15.

Willson, Patrick J., and Beverly Roberts Gaventa. "Preaching as the Re-Reading of Scripture." *Interpretation* 52, no. 4 (1998): 392-404.

Wilson, Robert R. *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World.* Yale Near Eastern Researches 7. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

———. "Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 169-189.

Wright, John W. "Beyond Transcendence and Immanence: The Characterization of the Presence and Activity of God in the Book of Chronicles." Pages 240-267 in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein.* Edited by Matt Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie and Gary N. Knoppers. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 371. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.

Wyschogrod, Edith. *An Ethics of Remembering: History, Heterology, and the Nameless Others.* Edited by Mark C. Taylor. Religion and Postmodernism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Appendix A

Reference Data

A.1 Succession Formulas in Chronicles

Standard Formula: "and X, his son, was king after him" (וימלך X בנו תחתיו)
(cf. the succession formula in the Edomite king list 1 Chr 1:44-50)

No Succession Formula for David (cf. 1 Chr 10:14b, 11:1-3)

1 Chr 19:1	Hanun (Ammonite King after Nahash, Formula Omits Personal Name)
1 Chr 29:28	Solomon (Followed by David's Closing Regnal Summary)
2 Chr 9:31	Rehoboam
2 Chr 12:16	Abijah
2 Chr 13:23	Asa
2 Chr 17:1	Jehoshaphat
2 Chr 21:1	Jehoram
2 Chr 22:1	Ahaziah (וימליכו יושבי ירושלם את אחזיהו בנו הקטן תחתיו)

No Succession Formula for Athaliah (cf. 2 Chr 22:12b) and Joash (cf. 2 Chr 23:11)

2 Chr 24:27	Amaziah
2 Chr 26:1	Uzziah (ויקחו כל עם יהודה את עזיהו והוא בן שש עשרה שנה וימליכו אותו תחת אביו אמציהו)
2 Chr 26:23	Jotham
2 Chr 27:9	Ahaz
2 Chr 28:27	Hezekiah
2 Chr 32:33	Manasseh
2 Chr 33:20	Amon
2 Chr 33:25	Josiah (וימליכו עם הארץ את יאשיהו בנו תחתיו)
2 Chr 36:1	Jehoahaz (ויקחו עם הארץ את יהואחז בן יאשיהו וימליכהו תחת אביו בירושלם)
2 Chr 36:4	Eliakim/Jehoiakim (וימלך מלך מצרים את אליקים אחיו על יהודה וירושלם)
2 Chr 36:8	Jehoiachin
2 Chr 36:10	Zedekiah (וימלך את צדקיהו אחיו על יהודה וירושלם)

A.2 Table of the Distribution of Grammatical Forms in Use in Major Units

Distribution of Grammatical Forms in Use in Major Units	**Nouns and Pronouns**	**Verbs**	**Adjectives**	**Particles**	**Noun to Verb Ratio**
33:25b – 36:1	598	237	49	782	2.52
34:1 – 35:27	582	234	49	772	2.49
34:2b-33b	320	144	20	437	2.22
34:3-13	118	49	6	168	2.41
34:3a	6	3	1	7	2.00
34:3b-7	44	15	2	64	2.93
34:8 – 35:19	463	175	39	595	2.65
34:8-33	268	124	17	361	2.16
34:8-13	73	31	3	97	2.36
34:14-18	44	21	0	52	2.10
34:19-21	29	13	2	45	2.23
34:22-28	60	38	8	97	1.58
34:29-33	62	21	4	70	2.95
35:1-19	195	51	22	234	3.82
35:1-6	56	17	4	58	3.29
35:7-9	41	5	14	42	8.20
35:10-16	70	21	0	101	3.33
35:17-19	28	8	4	33	3.50
35:20-25	51	34	1	82	1.50

A.3 Table of Structural Techniques in Use in Major Units

Structural Techniques in Use in Major Units	Resumptive Repetition	Inclusio	Cohesion	Transition	Concentricity	Temporal Markers	Direct Speech	Character and Setting Constellations
33:25b – 36:1	X							
34:1 – 35:27		X	X			X		
34:2b-33b		X						
34:3-13						X		
34:3a						X		
34:3b-7		X	X			X		X
34:8 – 35:19		X		X		X		
34:8-33				X	X	X		
34:8-13			X	X		X		X
34:14-18				X		X	X	X
34:19-21							X	X
34:22-28							X	X
34:29-33			X					X
35:1-19		X	X			X		X
35:1-6			X			X	X	X
35:7-9			X					(X)
35:10-16		X	X					X
35:17-19		X	X			X		
35:20-25				X		X		X

A.4 Structure of 2 Chr 33:25b–36:1 with Notes on Chronology and Direct Speech (DS)

[Accession (33:25b)]	
Introduction (34:1-2)	Regnal Dating
Introductory Summary (34:2b)	
Josiah Seeks God (34:3a)	8th Year
The Purge of Jerusalem, Judah, and Israel (34:3b-7)	12th Year
Repairs for the Temple (34:8-13)	18th Year Start
The Book of the Law (34:14-18) **DS**	ב
The King's Response (34:19-21) **DS**	ויהי כ
Huldah and Her Oracle (34:22-28) **DS**	
Covenant in the Temple (34:29-33)	
Concluding Summary (34:33b)	
The Passover of Jerusalem, Judah, and Israel (35:1-19)	14th of 1st Month
Preparations (35:1-6) **DS**	
Contributions (35:7-9)	
Service (35:10-16)	
Evaluation (35:17-19)	18th Year End
Death of Josiah (35:20-25) **DS**	אחרי כל־זאת
Conclusion (35:26-27)	
[Succession (36:1)]	